



ANNEX 9 PEOPLE-CENTRED EVALUATIONS

UNDP evaluations typically apply the six [OECD-DAC criteria](#): relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. These criteria can fully accommodate a people-centred lens by focusing on whether interventions align with people’s rights, needs and experiences, and whether they are contributing to more just, inclusive and accountable systems.

Evaluations are also guided by key UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) documents, including the [Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#), the guidance on [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#), and the [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). These frameworks ensure that evaluations are conducted with rigor, ethical integrity, and attention to human rights and gender equality, while the OECD-DAC criteria provide the structure for assessing performance.

The table below presents examples of how a people-centred lens can be integrated into each OECD/DAC criterion.



Programming tip

When planning evaluations, involve people affected by the intervention in shaping evaluation questions, interpreting findings and identifying lessons. Doing so enhances relevance, accountability and learning.



BetterEvaluation, [“Participatory Evaluation”](#).
BetterEvaluation, [“Empowerment Evaluation”](#).

Oecd-dac criteria	People-centred lens
Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things?	<div>→ Does the intervention respond to justice and security problems as people experience and define them?</div> <div>→ Is it aligned with the needs and rights of those most at risk of exclusion?</div>
Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?	<div>→ Does it connect with other efforts across sectors (e.g., rule of law, stabilization, livelihoods, gender, prevention of violence) to address both symptoms and root causes of injustice and insecurity?</div> <div>→ Are deliberate efforts made to coordinate across sectors, mandates and institutions to strengthen accessible, accountable and legitimate justice and security systems?</div>
Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?	<div>→ Has the intervention improved people’s experiences of justice, sense of fairness, sense of safety, or trust in institutions?</div> <div>→ Are there observable shifts in participation, power dynamics or access for marginalized groups?</div>
Efficiency: How well are resources being used?	<div>→ Does the intervention support locally led, inclusive and cost-effective solutions?</div> <div>→ Has it built capacity among institutions and communities to sustain results?</div>
Impact: What difference does the intervention make?	<div>→ Has the intervention contributed to change in systems (e.g., behaviours, institutional culture, norms)?</div> <div>→ Are institutions becoming more inclusive, accountable and rights-respecting?</div> <div>→ Have there been changes in people’s lives—for example, changes in how they experience justice and security systems in terms of access, fairness and trust, or how these outcomes have affected their well-being?</div>
Sustainability: Will the benefits last?	<div>→ Is there shared ownership by communities and/or institutions?</div> <div>→ Are systems in place for ongoing community engagement, feedback and adaptation?</div> <div>→ Is political and institutional commitment likely to continue?</div> <div>→ Are the positive changes people have experienced, such as being able to access support to resolve disputes or feeling safer, likely to be maintained over time?</div>