Results-Based Management (RBM) approach Presentation for Intangible Cultural Heritage Category 2 Institutes

“A nation is alive as long as its culture is alive”

Bureau of Strategic Planning

2013
Results-Based Management (RBM)

Pillar of the UN Reform

UNESCO Reform

“RBM is a participatory and team-based approach to management designed to improve programme delivery and management effectiveness, efficiency and accountability that focuses on achieving defined results, and should be applied in all stages of programming.”

The RBM approach entails:
- Emphasis on **results**.
- Shifting the **focus** from how things are done to **what is accomplished**.
UNESCO Programme Management Framework

C/4 Medium-Term Strategy (6 years)

C/5 Programme and Budget (2 years)

Work plans (2 years)
The 34 C/4, the 35 C/5 and 36 C/5

34 C/4 (2008-2013)

35 C/5 – 36 C/5

Major Programme

Biennial Sectoral Priority

Main Line of Action

- Result

Grouping

- Thematic/Regional

Activity/Extrabudgetary project/Office 5

Intersectoral Platforms
**RBM: The transformative process/intervention logic**

**Issue to be tackled:** Economic difficulty

**Result:** change

**Output/deliverable:** first effect which contributes to attaining the result

**Intervention:** act to be undertaken

**Input:** available resources

---

Group Work 1
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New knowledge and dissemination:
**Ex1:** Establishment of the local association on crafts to disseminate the artistic products to the public at large.

Roles and responsibilities:
**Ex1:** as a beneficiary: the members of the local association are informed by the exchange of experiences of the various stakeholders regarding the network of local association.
**Ex2:** as a partner: the local association will apply the standards established for the production of crafts goods.

Capacity-building of stakeholders directly involved:
**Ex1:** UNESCO, the aged villagers, network of local association, newly trained villagers.

Results-Based Management (RBM)
The “transformative process”
Programming framework
Programming framework

- Where do you stand?
  - Identification of the contribution to upstream result(s) (a prerequisite)

- Where do you start?
  - Assessment of the issues to be addressed
  - Identification of stakeholders involved and concerned
  - Estimation of resources available

- What are you going to achieve?
  - Formulation of results to be attained
  - Definition of measurable indicators

- How are you going to proceed?
  - Development of a strategy for implementation and attainment of results
Results framework/chain

Identification of the contribution to outcomes of C/4 and expected results of C/5

C/4 Medium-Term Strategy

C/5 Programme and Budget

Workplans

Overarching Objectives (Expected outcomes)

Strategic Programme Objectives (Expected outcomes)

Major Programme

Biennial Sectoral Priority

Main line of Action (Expected results)

Grouping

Activity/Extrabudgetary project (Expected results)
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Situation analysis
Assessing the issues to be addressed

Analysis of the situation prevailing before the intervention in order to identify the issues (and baseline) to be addressed within UNESCO’s areas of competence.

- What is the current situation in the field of your work (the situation by the end of previous biennium)?

- What are the key issues to be addressed during the next two years (and within the longer-term framework)?

- What could be done differently to improve the future performance, based on the experience of the past?
Situation analysis
Elements to be considered

• The human-rights based approach, including gender equality to avoid perpetuating inequalities

• Risk management to obtain the most realistic planning

• Geographical scope: global or by region(s), by sub-region(s) or by country to determine the geographical zone that will benefit from the activity

• The Stakeholders: the target groups and the partners to define specifically the role and responsibility of the direct beneficiaries and partners involved

• The financial and human resources to estimate what is necessary in terms of budget and team
**Issue**

Shortage of qualified practitioners ensuring development and implementation of safeguarding frameworks & measures

**Effects**

- Loss of cultural diversity
- Intercultural dialogue diminished
- Social inclusion and cohesion endangered / Community sense of identity and continuity jeopardized
- Fail to develop ICH as a catalyst for sustainable development

**Causes**

- Lack of appropriate policies
- Decreasing inter-generational dialogue
- Limited capacities of practitioners to develop/implement frameworks
- Lack of communities involvement/ownership
- Lack of research and networking

---
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What do you think of the following statements:

- National capacities strengthened to develop and implement policies for intangible cultural heritage
- Member States supported in building technical and institutional capacities and improving mechanisms to safeguard intangible cultural heritage at the national, regional and global levels
- Communities assisted in engaging in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage
A result = a concrete, visible and measurable change in state, induced by an intervention.

- It focuses on the direct target groups
- It captures the change among the target groups
- It illustrates what the target groups will do differently after the Organization’s action
- It can be formulated in the past or present tense
- It has to be “SMART”
A result is not an output/deliverable

An output/deliverable = the first effect of the intervention which contributes to the attainment of results. It reflects the action of the Organization.

- It reflects the achieved action of the Organization
- It can be tangible or intangible
- It is formulated in the past tense
The use of newly acquired knowledge and skills (outputs/deliverables) by the intended beneficiaries is often what leads to the change in situation – the result.

National authority, in collaboration with the local communities, establish an inventory on intangible cultural heritage in the country X
- Assistance provided to the consultation process for coordinating the inventory
- Technical assistance provided for the formulation of the inventory

The country X ratifies the 2003 Convention and revises accordingly policies and legal frameworks
- Assistance provided to facilitate the ratification of the 2003 Convention
- Meetings have been organized in order to identify the needs for revising policies and legal framework to reinforce the implementation of the 2003 Convention

Local authorities in provinces Y and Z are implementing the safeguarding framework
- Awareness raised among local authorities on the safeguarding framework
- Challenges encountered in implementing safeguarding framework
Intangible cultural heritage national legislative and administrative safeguarding frameworks developed and implemented

Local authorities in provinces Y and Z are implementing the safeguarding framework
Challenges in results formulation: Can all results be SMART?
- Different nature of results (C/4, C/5, global, regional, national)

At the ICH level, a result:
- Captures the variety of situations in the different regions
- Is aggregated to enable the contribution of the workplan level
- Identifies the direct beneficiaries/target group with a focus on the change
- Induces a shared responsibility by illustrating what the target groups will do differently after the Organization’s action
- Can be formulated in the past or present tense
- Has to be “SMART”, which can prove challenging
Formulation of results need to be **SMART:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Specific: It needs to express the nature of the change expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Measurable: The level of attainment can be measured with qualitative or quantitative characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Achievable: It has to be realistic with the human and financial resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Relevant: It has to contribute to the attainment of the higher level results and respond to the identified needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Time-bound: Achievable within a specific timeframe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Result**: A concrete, visible and measurable change in state, induced by the intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator: Parameter used to assess and measure the progress related to an expected result or an aspect of it.</th>
<th>Means of verification: The data sources and methodologies used to measure and analyse performance.</th>
<th>Quantitative and/or qualitative Target/Benchmark: verifiable standard to be achieved at the end of the biennium. <strong>Baseline</strong>: the starting point from which progress towards expected results will be measured through the use of performance indicators.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Results

#### Planning for monitoring of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Result:</strong></th>
<th>Local authorities in province Y and Z are implementing the safeguarding framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI:</strong></td>
<td>% of recommendations in the framework implemented by local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means of verification:</strong></td>
<td>Annual Reports on the implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Target/Benchmark:** | 50 %  
2-3 criteria to assess how well it is implemented  
Baseline: (10%) |

Aggregation from workplans outputs/deliverables & results to C/5 outputs/deliverables & results
Remember *useful* performance indicators and associated target/benchmark are more important than they be *perfect* on paper!

% of recommendations in the framework implemented by local authorities. Target/Benchmark: 50%, 10 most important. Baseline: 10%.

- Data sources – how to obtain information?
- Frequency of data collection?
- Method and technique of collection and analysis?
- Stakeholders* concerned and involved?

* e.g. Other UNESCO Services/Sectors, UIS, UN volunteers, women or youth organisations, NGOs, Category 2 Institutes
Local authorities in province Y and Z are implementing the safeguarding framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Don’t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To demonstrate that the local authorities implement the framework</td>
<td>% of recommendations in the framework implemented by local authorities in province Y and Z</td>
<td>The N° of meetings held by UNESCO to which local authorities are attending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To stress that monitoring mechanisms are put in place to ensure the smooth implementation of the framework</td>
<td>Number of corrective measures put in place to overcome the challenges encountered or Monitoring mechanism established by local authorities</td>
<td>Monitoring mechanisms document provided by UNESCO experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring results against performance indicators and benchmarks</td>
<td>50% of priorities highlighted in the safeguarding framework addressed by ICH practitioners (Baseline: 10%)</td>
<td>Action plan and management procedures and reports by ICH practitioners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measuring performance of the process and the pertinence of the deliverables (interventions and outputs) | Quality of the technical assistance provided | Feedback provided by concerned stakeholder during and preceding meetings | Analytical assessment of the feedback received | During the follow-up meeting, ensure agenda item on the satisfaction of the different stakeholders of the process | Cat. 2 in charge of collecting and managing the feedback received and report back to CLT on challenges and successes in order to benefit from the lessons learnt in future programme development |
National capacities strengthened to develop and implement policies for intangible cultural heritage

- Performance Indicator:
  N° of countries supported by Cat. 2 in developing and/or revising and implementing ICH policies

Member States develop and implement policies for intangible cultural heritage

- Performance Indicator:
  N° of supported countries by Cat. 2 developed and/or revised and implemented ICH policies
**Example of a results framework when programming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Result N°1:</th>
<th>Performance indicator (PI):</th>
<th>Baseline (b):</th>
<th>Means of Verification (MoV):</th>
<th>Quantitative and/or qualitative Target/Benchmark (T):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·1.1:</td>
<td>b·1.1:</td>
<td>VoF·1.1:</td>
<td>T·1.1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·1.2:</td>
<td>b·1.2:</td>
<td>VoF·1.2:</td>
<td>T·1.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable N°1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·1.1:</td>
<td>b·1.1:</td>
<td>VoF·1.1:</td>
<td>T·1.1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·1.2:</td>
<td>b·1.2:</td>
<td>VoF·1.2:</td>
<td>T·1.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable N°1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·1.2:</td>
<td>b·1.2:</td>
<td>VoF·1.2:</td>
<td>T·1.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable N°1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·1.3:</td>
<td>b·1.3:</td>
<td>VoF·1.3:</td>
<td>T·1.3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Result N°2:</td>
<td>Performance indicator (PI):</td>
<td>Baseline (b):</td>
<td>Means of Verification (MoV):</td>
<td>Quantitative and/or qualitative Target/Benchmark (T):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·2.1:</td>
<td>b·2.1:</td>
<td>VoF·2.1:</td>
<td>T·2.1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·2.2:</td>
<td>b·2.2:</td>
<td>VoF·2.2:</td>
<td>T·2.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable N°2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·2.1:</td>
<td>b·2.1:</td>
<td>VoF·2.1:</td>
<td>T·2.1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·2.2:</td>
<td>b·2.2:</td>
<td>VoF·2.2:</td>
<td>T·2.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable N°2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·2.2:</td>
<td>b·2.2:</td>
<td>VoF·2.2:</td>
<td>T·2.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable N°2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI·2.3:</td>
<td>b·2.3:</td>
<td>VoF·2.3:</td>
<td>T·2.3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribution of results achievements to Category 2 Institute Expected Result (and associated PI)**
Programming framework: Recap

- Where do you stand?
  - Identification of the contribution to upstream result(s) (a prerequisite)

- Where do you start?
  - Assessment of the issues to be addressed
  - Identification of stakeholders involved and concerned
  - Estimation of resources available

- What are you going to achieve?
  - Formulation of results to be attained
  - Definition of measurable indicators

- How are you going to proceed?
  - Development of a strategy for implementation and attainment of results
Correction of the **Brain teaser**

**B2. Increasing opportunities for quality basic education for children through community learning centres.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Output /deliverable</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation strategy explains how to move from the current situation to the one described in the result statement.

**A**

- Situation analysis
  - Exit or transition strategy
  - Linkage to other activities or projects?

**B**

- Expected results
  - Key outputs* (follow-up measures) leading to results and long-term vision
  - Stakeholders (roles and responsibilities)
  - Conclusions of risk analysis

* Deliverables
Balance among the three “R”s

Results

Reach*

Resources

* The geographical scope and aim, breadth and depth of influence and cooperation with stakeholders
37 C/4 and C/5
UNESCO Programme Management Framework

C/4 Medium-Term Strategy (8 years)

C/5 Programme (4 years) & Budget (2 years)

Workplans (Results: 4 years; Budget: 2 years)

- **8 Years** timeframe for **C/4 Strategic Objectives**
- **4 Years** timeframe for **C/5 Programme & workplans, expected results (ERs) and key outputs/deliverables.**
  - **C/5 ERs:** Targets/Benchmarks associated to Performance indicators are set for **2017**
  - **Workplan ERs:** Targets/Benchmarks associated to Performance indicators are set for **2015 & 2017**
- **2 Years** timeframe for **Regular Programme Budget**
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37 C/4 and C/5
Continued

• Points to emphasize to advance further the RBM agenda:
  - **Rationale** of the **Intervention logic** when **programming** and **monitoring**:
    Why & How key outputs/deliverables will lead to workplan expected results and thereafter Why & How the latter will contribute to C/5 expected result and in turn Why & How the latter will contribute to C/4 **Strategic Objective**

  **Outputs/deliverables:**
e.g. “Awareness raised among local authorities on the safeguarding framework” or “Capacities built to develop safeguarding framework”

  **Workplan Result:**
e.g. “Local authorities in provinces Y and Z implement the safeguarding framework”

  **C/5 Result:**
e.g. “The intangible cultural heritage including indigenous and endangered languages safeguarded”

  **C/4 Strategic Objective:**
e.g. “Protecting, promoting and transmitting heritage”

  - **Results framework** including performance indicators and associated baseline and quantitative & qualitative targets/benchmarks for **results** and **key outputs/deliverables**.

  - **Aggregation review mechanism** from **workplans** to **C/5** for both **key outputs/deliverables** and **results** (through performance indicators and associated quantitative and/or qualitative targets/benchmark).

  - **Improving accountability**: Formalize further the link of **individual performance** on outputs/tasks to programme/activity/project **result achievements**.
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From **programming** to **implementation**

Validation cycle

Approval by the DG

Budget released

**Programming** period

**Implementation** period
Implementation
Monitoring:

“A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing [...] intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.”


Assessing progress, comparing the planned with the actual situation & making necessary changes if needed.
Monitor progress achieved against:

**Results**
Assessing achievements against performance indicators and associated targets/benchmarks & baselines
Do the outputs/deliverables contribute to the attainment of results? If so, how?

**Stakeholders and geographical scope**
Assessing the contribution and involvement of stakeholders (beneficiaries and partners).
Does the benefit cover the expected geographical area?

**Resources**
Assessing the expenditures and human resources involved.
# Monitoring implementation

## Planned versus Actual

### Implementation strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical assistance and support to Country A to enhance the effective safeguarding of ICH X</td>
<td>Workshop held for concerned stakeholders to identify and prioritize the key issues to be addressed and adopt framework</td>
<td>National authorities, ICH practitioners, concerned community members, Category 2 Institute actively engaged in the process</td>
<td>Workshop was held. It proved to be a fruitful exchange of experience and concern from the different concerned stakeholders. 15 recommendations were identified and 5 were underlined as urgent priority areas for intervention. The framework is still in its finalization phase and is expected to be adopted by the end of the month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expected Result

ICH practitioners start to implement the safeguarding framework adopted with support from National authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator(s)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Programmed benchmark</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of priorities highlighted in the safeguarding framework addressed by ICH practitioners</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis of management procedures in place and reports by ICH practitioners</td>
<td>Target: 50 % (Baseline: 10 %)</td>
<td>As the safeguarding framework is still in drafting phase it is too early at this point to report on results. However the workshop held contributed to sensitizing ICH practitioners on the crucial needs for improved safeguarding. This is expected to contribute to the successful implementation of the safeguarding framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why invest resources in monitoring*?

It informs management on the assessment of the implementation.

It informs reporting on progress achieved towards the attainment of intended results to concerned stakeholders including the management of the Organization. Aim at evidence-based Result-oriented reporting.

* As a general rule of thumb, about 5% of the resources should be set aside for this purpose.
Monitoring informs management

Documentation and assessment of the performance and progress achieved will allow you to answer the question: “Is the implementation on track?”:

**Yes**: the information demonstrates that the **assumptions** of your programming framework **remain valid** and that implementation can continue as planned.

**No**: the information allows you to take **informed decision** on the onwards management of the implementation - what adjustments would be required? Adapting the implementation or reprogramming the results?
When to reprogramme*?

If the assumptions of the programming framework are not valid or if an event or change of situation hinders the attainment of the expected result, it may be necessary to redefine the result and its relation to higher-level results (results chain).

Examples: A natural catastrophe; a new decentralized activity; a management decision to address other or new priorities.

Reprogramming is subject to validation from the Field Office Director and the upstream level

Accountability is associated to results thus when the expected results or results chain change, validation is required to ensure agreement on the change and to retain overall programme coherence.
Example of a results framework when monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected-Result-N°1:</th>
<th>Performance-indicator (PI):</th>
<th>Baseline (b):</th>
<th>Quantitative-and/or-qualitative-Target/Benchmark (T):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable-N°1.1</td>
<td>PI-1.1:</td>
<td>b-1.1:</td>
<td>T-1.1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable-N°1.2</td>
<td>PI-1.2:</td>
<td>b-1.2:</td>
<td>T-1.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable-N°1.3</td>
<td>PI-1.3:</td>
<td>b-1.3:</td>
<td>T-1.3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected-Result-N°2:</th>
<th>Performance-indicator (PI):</th>
<th>Baseline (b):</th>
<th>Quantitative-and/or-qualitative-Target/Benchmark (T):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable-N°2.1</td>
<td>PI-2.1:</td>
<td>b-2.1:</td>
<td>T-2.1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable-N°2.2</td>
<td>PI-2.2:</td>
<td>b-2.2:</td>
<td>T-2.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/deliverable-N°2.3</td>
<td>PI-2.3:</td>
<td>b-2.3:</td>
<td>T-2.3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achievements and challenges and lessons learnt:

Contribution of results achievements to Category 2 Institute Expected Result attainment (and associated information)

Overall implementation of the Activity:

- Does not meet expectations
- Partially meets expectations
- Meets expectations
- Exceeds expectations
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Monitoring informs reporting

The information obtained through systematic monitoring informs concerned stakeholders on the progress achieved, challenges and lessons learnt through reporting.

Reporting accounts for the resources entrusted in the Organization in terms of results attained and informs the management of the Organisation including decision-making on corrective measures required and future programme development.
C/5 Programme and Budget (2 years)

EX/4 Report by the Director-General on the implementation of the programme adopted by the General Conference (Every 6 months)

Joint EX/4-C/3 Report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization (Every second year)
A process that assesses in a systematic and objective manner the achievements of results in the light of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of on-going and completed activities, projects and programmes.

It is about: Learning from successful and less successful activities; Improving programme delivery, policy development and decision-making processes; enhancing accountability for the resources entrusted.

**Key questions:** are we doing the right things, are we doing it right and are there better ways of achieving the results?

3 Types of evaluations: **Ex-Ante, Mid-Term, Ex-Post.**

* As a general rule of thumb, about 1% of the resources should be set aside for this purpose.
Do not hesitate to contact:

Othilie du Souich at 8-13-37 or at o.du-souich@unesco.org

All training materials and documentation are available on the
http://www.unesco.org/bsp
Resource slides
Performance indicators must be measurable and data should be available over the duration of the intervention. Six criteria can be used to test the relevance of an indicator:

1. **Validity**: does it measure what it is intended?
2. **Reliability**: is it a consistent measure over time?
3. **Sensitivity**: when situation changes will it be sensitive to those changes?
4. **Simplicity**: will it be easy to collect and analyse the information?
5. **Utility**: will the information be useful for decision-making and learning?
6. **Affordability**: is it cost-effective?
Baseline and Targets/Benchmarks

- **Baseline**: Where we were
- **Target/Benchmark**: Where we wanted to be
- **Measurement at a given point in time**: Where we actually are

**Commitment**

**Performance**
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