



UNEG

United Nations Evaluation Group

Exploratory study on the implications of the governance structures of UNEG members in promoting the use of evaluative evidence for informed decision-making

This document was prepared by Paul Balogun and submitted by SO2 Use of Evaluation Working Group to 2017 AGM for discussion.

Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VI
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODS AND LIMITATIONS	2
A. Methods	2
B. Limitations.....	3
III. THE CURRENT STATUS OF INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN PLACE WITHIN INDIVIDUAL UNEG MEMBERS FOR PROVIDING EVALUATIVE EVIDENCE TO GOVERNING BODIES	4
IV. FINDINGS	10
A. Institutional mechanisms in place.....	10
B. Stages of the evaluation process where evaluation units engage with governing bodies	13
C. Products and breadth of evaluations presented to the governing bodies	16
D. Ensuring credibility	17
E. Uptake of evaluations	18
F. Reporting on implementation of evaluation recommendations to governing bodies	22
V. IMPLICATIONS FOR UNEG'S FUTURE WORK ON ENHANCING EVALUATION USE 27	
ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE STUDY	29
ANNEX II - A. UNEG AS OF JUNE 2016: 47 MEMBERS AND 3 OBSERVERS, SECRETARIAT HOSTED BY UNDP IEO.....	34
ANNEX III: OVERVIEW OF WHAT EVIDENCE PROVIDED DIRECTLY BY INDIVIDUAL UNEG MEMBERS	35
ANNEX IV: ANALYSIS OF THE DEGREE TO WHICH UNEG MEMBERS HAVE FORMAL SYSTEMS IN PLACE THAT MANAGE THE PRESENTATION AND USE OF EVALUATIVE EVIDENCE BY THE MEMBER'S GOVERNING BODY	38
ANNEX V: THE SURVEY QUESTIONS AND SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM UNEG MEMBERS THAT HAVE INSTITUTIONALISED THE REGULAR REPORTING AND CONSIDERATION OF EVALUATIVE EVIDENCE BY THEIR GOVERNING BODY	87

Abbreviations and acronyms

CTBTO	Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization
DGACM	United Nations Department for General Assembly and Conference Management
DPKO-DFS	Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department for Field Support
DSS	United Nations Department of Safety and Security
ECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
ECLAC	United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ESCWA	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for West Asia
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
FAO	The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	The Global Environment Facility
IAEA	The International Atomic Energy Agency
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ITC	International Trade Centre
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services
OPCW	Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PBSO	United Nations Peace Building Support Office
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UN DPI	United Nations Department of Public Information
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNAIDS	The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECE	Economic Commission for Europe
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

UNV	United Nations Volunteers
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organisation
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

Executive Summary

1. The objective of this exploratory study was to identify structural issues that promote or hinder the use of impartial evaluative evidence for improved decision-making of the governing bodies of UNEG members and so contribute to learning on practices and/or institutional arrangements that support use of evaluations to inform strategic choices and decisions. The intent is that it provides the basis for the UNEG membership to identify issues to take forward within UNEG's broader work on evaluation use.
2. Subjects covered in the report and how they respond to the questions posed in the ToR are:
 - a) What are the existing institutional arrangements between evaluation units and governing bodies, and what purpose do they serve (to inform the evaluation planning, to report on planning results, to report on the implementation of recommendations) (responding to questions i, ii, and iii in the ToR);
 - b) What type of products and what scope of evaluations are presented to governing bodies (responding to questions iv and v in the ToR); and
 - c) What are the lessons learnt/good practices on the basis of what UNEG members report having been the evaluations that have mostly informed major strategic decisions, and what senior managers/members of the governing bodies report to be (responding to questions iv, v, vi, and vii in the ToR).
3. The study was carried out mainly between late October 2016 and end January 2017, when a draft report was discussed with UNEG's Strategic Objective 2 team which was responsible for over-sight of the work. Comments from the team were incorporated into the draft and the draft report was then presented at the May 2017 meeting of the UNEG membership. The report is structured as follows:
 - a) Section 2 describes the limitations of the study;
 - b) Section 3 sets out the current status across the UNEG membership in terms of the systems and practices in place for providing evaluative evidence for use by the members' governing bodies and is essentially descriptive in nature;
 - c) Section 4 builds on this description and evidence from interviews with a number of UNEG key informants and responses to a survey across the membership to draw out possible lessons and implications for further reflection against each of the seven areas identified above; and
 - d) Section 5 concludes by setting out a number of areas that the UNEG membership is considering taking forward within UNEG's broader work on evaluation use.
4. In reading this study, three issues need to be borne in mind. First, the roles and responsibilities of the members of a governing body, even when called an Executive Board, should differ from those of an organisation's senior management. Yet, while as illustrated in the ToR and the broader literature there has been work on the use of evaluative evidence by managers, little exists on the use of evaluative evidence by governing bodies and what should constitute good practice in such contexts. Review of the UNEG Norms and Standards also showed that there was not clear guidance or normative standards in this area. Second, little analysis exists across the UNEG membership of what approaches have been put in place by the individual members to provide evaluative evidence to their governing bodies or their experiences in how this evidence is used. Third, the resources and time available for the work were relatively modest and the whole study was to be completed in three calendar months which put limits on the level of consultation across the wider range of stakeholders. These parameters had two consequences. First, significant time and other resources were required to first set out what is

actually in place across the UNEG membership, which as discussed below meant that not all methods set out in the ToR could be used. Second, a deductive evaluation approach to assess experience against a pre-defined normative framework was not feasible. The exploratory approach therefore needed to be inductive.

5. The first step was to map out present practice across the UNEG members in terms of institutional arrangements in place for providing evaluative evidence to their governing bodies. As shown in the body of the report, initial exploratory analysis strongly suggests that the key contextual factor varying across the membership is the degree of access to the governing body and this was used to group the members.

For UNEG members that have institutionalised a system to provide regular evidence to their Governing Body

6. The findings in Section IV would suggest that lessons and practice found in the 19 members that have institutionalised systems and approaches may not have great relevance for most of the other members. This is mainly because the context is probably too different in many cases (because the opportunity to link with the Governing Body isn't there), the organisation has an alternative system in place that meets this need, or the need is not prioritised by the key stakeholders involved.
7. While as illustrated in the ToR and the broader literature there has been work on the use of evaluative evidence, little exists on the use of evaluative evidence by governing bodies rather than senior managers and what constitutes good practice in such contexts. The assumption is that the roles and responsibilities of the members of a governing body, even when called an Executive Board, should differ from those of an organisation's senior management. Therefore what evaluative evidence they might require and how it would be used might also differ.
8. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** De facto, an explicit theory, drawing on empirical evidence, for how Governing Bodies would use evaluative evidence is lacking. This study provides some of the empirical evidence required to plug this gap, as it sets out what has been done to institutionalise the availability of evidence. What is now required is to explore the degree to which the over-sight role of Governing Bodies means that how they use such evidence differs from that of senior managers. Obvious differences include: (a) capacity, expertise and time availability of Governing Body members; (b) knowledge of the organisation and so the relevance/feasibility of recommendations; and (c) the fact that the Board's role is oversight and not management decision making. It should then be possible to explore whether supply and demand are aligned and develop an explicit theory based on the empirical evidence.
9. Across the 19 members where systems and approaches have been institutionalised, these look broadly similar at first sight.
10. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** Nevertheless, key informant interviews, the survey responses, and the personal experience of the author all show that in fact there is a diversity across these organisations in terms of their context and what is prioritised in these systems. Before drawing out lessons it would be good practice to consider whether, and what, contextual factors affect which lessons will be relevant to which members.
11. This study has drawn a distinction between organisations where there is institutionalised systems for consideration of evaluative evidence by the Governing Body relative to organisations where this has not occurred. This does not mean that it should be assumed that institutionalisation necessarily leads to greater use of evaluative evidence by senior management; those who are ultimately responsible for implementing change.
12. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** This is an assumption that may need to be examined by UNEG. Looking forward, this scoping study has identified both which organisations have institutionalised the use of evaluative evidence by a Governing Body and how they have done so. However, before drawing lessons, good practice would be to examine whether this really

has been a necessary condition for enhanced use of evaluation evidence and findings by senior management, and also whether or not sufficient and in what contexts. In particular, interviews and anecdotal evidence suggests divergent views on the degree to which management response systems and systems reporting implementation of recommendations are truly effective in enhancing use rather than gaming of the system by senior management. This will be challenging, since the main analysis of use across the UN is the JIU's¹ 2014 which notes that *'It was realized during the scoping for the study that, while anecdotal evidence exists, the assessment of the impact from the use of evaluation and its products by the various organizations was almost non-existent'*. Given the resource implications, this would suggest the need to use a case based approach to getting the evidence of use needed to examine the question.

UNEG Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place, but OIOS has a role in evaluating the organisation's performance

13. Where OIOS has an evaluation mandate, the context and ability of the evaluation functions to directly engage with their organisation's governing body appears severely restricted. This may be because the General Assembly and its subsidiary committees consider that OIOS provides sufficient evaluative evidence to meet their needs, but also the fact that OIOS' own experience is that the capacity of such committees to consider evaluative evidence may be limited anyway. This in turn strongly suggests that it would be difficult to directly transpose lessons from those UNEG members that have institutionalised such systems and approaches. On the other hand, there are indications that at least for some of these organisations, there is consideration of evaluative evidence by bodies that depending upon the organisation carry out some of the over-sight functions of a conventional Governing Body.
14. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** A potential next step would be for UNEG to carry out analysis within this group to classify the various oversight approaches found and hence the opportunities, and limits, imposed to enhancing the use of evaluative evidence through these over-sight mechanisms. At this point it would be possible to identify whether there are organisations within this group that could draw on the lessons and experience of UN Women, UNEP and ESCAP which are nominally part of the Secretariat but where aspects of over-sight have been delegated by the General Assembly to an Executive Body and so it has been possible to institutionalise consideration of evaluation evidence by an over-sight body.
15. Allied with investment in examining the use of evaluative evidence, as proposed above, this would provide the evidence base to draw out lessons that relevant to the varying contexts of these UNEG members.

UNEG Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place and OIOS has no role in evaluating the organisation's performance

16. For the 12 organisations where OIOS has no oversight role but they haven't institutionalised consideration of evaluation evidence by the Governing Body, again there is little evidence to suggest that there would be much sense or opportunity to transfer lesson from those that have institutionalised an approach. It would appear that UNAIDS and WIPO have systems in place that link evaluation with their respective governing bodies, but these operate differently to those found elsewhere. In UNITAR some development of an approach to institutionalisation is being considered. In the remaining cases, it appears that there is neither pressure from management or the Governing Body to prioritise evaluation.

¹ Prom-Jackson, S. and G. A. Bartsiotas (2014) Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system. JIU/REP/2014/6. https://www.unjiu.org/en/reports-notes/JIU%20Products/JIU_REP_2014_6_English.pdf.

17. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** In conclusion, it does not appear that UNEG would have a comparative advantage in addressing the needs of these organisations in this area or developing relevant lessons. Their contexts are too specific.

I. Introduction

1. At its Annual General Meeting in 2016, UNEG decided to focus its efforts on ‘the support of senior decision-makers, and their commitment to the implementation of recommendations’ as one of the most critical and yet not fully explored factors affecting the use of evaluation. As part of this focus and as approved in its programme of work 2016-2017, UNEG commissioned this exploratory study on the implications of the governance structures of UNEG members in promoting the use of evaluative evidence for informed decision-making.
2. The objective of this exploratory study² was to identify structural issues that promote or hinder the use of impartial evaluative evidence for improved decision-making of the governing bodies of UNEG members and so contribute to learning on practices and/or institutional arrangements that support use of evaluations to inform strategic choices and decisions. The intent is that it provides the basis for the UNEG membership to identify issues to take forward within UNEG's broader work on evaluation use.
3. Subjects covered in the report and how they respond to the questions posed in the ToR are:
 - a) What are the existing institutional arrangements between evaluation units and governing bodies, and what purpose do they serve (to inform the evaluation planning, to report on planning results, to report on the implementation of recommendations) (responding to questions i, ii, and iii in the ToR).
 - b) What type of products and what scope of evaluations are presented to governing bodies (responding to questions iv and v in the ToR).
 - c) What are the lessons learnt/good practices on the basis of what UNEG members report having been the evaluations that have mostly informed major strategic decisions, and what senior managers/members of the governing bodies report to be (responding to questions iv, v, vi, and vii in the ToR).
4. The study was carried out mainly between late October 2016 and end January 2017, when a draft report was discussed with UNEG's Strategic Objective 2 team³ which was responsible for over-sight of the work. Comments from the team were incorporated into the draft and the draft report was then presented at the May 2017 meeting of the UNEG membership.
5. The report is structured as follows:
 - a) Section 2 describes the limitations of the study;
 - b) Section 3 sets out the current status across the UNEG membership in terms of the systems and practices in place for providing evaluative evidence for use by the members' governing bodies and is essentially descriptive in nature;
 - c) Section 4 builds on this description and evidence from interviews with a number of UNEG key informants and responses to a survey across the membership to draw out possible lessons and implications for further reflection against each of the seven areas identified above; and
 - d) Section 5 concludes by setting out a number of areas that the UNEG membership is considering taking forward within UNEG's broader work on evaluation use.

² See Terms of Reference, Annex I.

³ The dedicated UNEG working sub-group comprised of representatives of the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), the office of evaluation at ILO, the evaluation unit at UNITAR and the independent office of evaluation at IFAD (convener).

II. Methods and limitations

A. Methods

6. The study's approach reflected three main design parameters. First, the roles and responsibilities of the members of a governing body, even when called an Executive Board, should differ from those of an organisation's senior management. Yet, while as illustrated in the ToR and the broader literature there has been work on the use of evaluative evidence by managers, little exists on the use of evaluative evidence by governing bodies and what should constitute good practice in such contexts. Review of the UNEG Norms and Standards also showed that there was not clear guidance or normative standards in this area. Second, little analysis exists across the UNEG membership of what approaches have been put in place by the individual members to provide evaluative evidence to their governing bodies or their experiences in how this evidence is used. Third, the resources and time available for the work were relatively modest and the whole study was to be completed in three calendar months which put limits on the level of consultation across the wider range of stakeholders. These parameters had two consequences. First, significant time and other resources were required to first set out what is actually in place across the UNEG membership, which as discussed below meant that not all methods set out in the ToR could be used. Second, a deductive evaluation approach to assess experience against a pre-defined normative framework was not feasible. The exploratory approach therefore needed to be inductive.
7. Given the exploratory nature of the study it is also important to recognise that the description of current practice across the membership clearly revealed significant variation in the contexts within which the individual UNEG members operate and the degree to which the evaluation functions have an opportunity to present evaluative evidence to their governing bodies. This therefore immediately raised the issue of the degree to which lessons drawn from some members would be valid within the context of other members and more focus on the issue of external validity than reflected in the approach set out on the ToR.
8. The first step was to map out present practice across the UNEG members in terms of institutional arrangements in place for providing evaluative evidence to their governing bodies. The framework⁴ used for doing this was developed through a rapid review of current practice in a number of the members and a brief review of the literature, supplemented by interviews with a number of UNEG key informants, and discussion with the SO2 team. This framework was then populated with evidence on practice by drawing on the following evidence sources:
 - a) The descriptions of practice for the individual UNEG members found on the UNEG website;
 - b) Brief review of material found on the evaluation functions' own websites (where accessible) and documentation presented at recent meetings of the organisations' Governing Bodies to both fill gaps and cross check what was taken from the UNEG site;
 - c) Evidence compiled through (a) and (b) above was then sent to the individual members who were asked to review and correct evidence for their own organisation. Out of the 47 UNEG members, 23 responded (see Annex II).
 - d) For independence, evaluation functions were rated as independent if they had been judged to be transitioning to level 4 or were at 4 or above in the JIU's recently (2014)

⁴ The basic framework developed is at Annex II.

completed assessment of evaluation functions.⁵ For functions that were not included in the JIU sample, evaluation policies were assessed where necessary to check if independent or not, against the same metric as used in the JIU study.

9. The second step was to create discrete and well defined groups based on UNEG members' practice. To help explore the evidence and pattern matching, interviews were carried out with six heads of evaluation within the UNEG membership covering a range of contexts and circumstances - UNICEF, UNWRA, UNDP, ITC, WHO and OIOS. Interviews also covered the main drivers for use of evaluative evidence by governing bodies or factors that constrained its potential use and so widen the number of factors considered when looking for patterns. As shown in the following section III, initial exploratory analysis strongly suggests that the key contextual factor varying across the membership is the degree of access to the governing body and this was used to group the members.
10. Results from this inductive analytical approach of pattern matching was then combined with the focus provided by the seven areas where the ToR identified as areas to learn lessons in to develop a questionnaire that was sent to all 47 UNEG members. The survey was launched in early December 2016 and three reminders were sent out to those who had not completed the survey in the following month. In total, responses were received from 27 UNEG members (see Annex II for who responded. The survey questions and summaries of responses from members with experience of regularly presenting evaluative evidence to their Governing Body can be found at Annex IV.

B. Limitations

11. A lack of time and resources meant that three activities initially planned and which would have allowed triangulation were not carried out. These were: (a) interviews of senior managers and representatives from governing bodies; (b) seeking the views of key informants from evaluation functions outside of UNEG - from bilateral aid organisations and the IFIs - of their perspectives on the role and use of evaluations by governing bodies within the UN system; and (c) selected case studies. This limited our ability to identify lessons around issues (v) and (vi) in the ToR and directly address issue (vii) which deals directly with the opinions of senior decision makers and Board members.
12. As important, while the survey responses provided evidence on what is in place and opinions on how operates, by their nature, surveys don't provide evidence on how and why things happen which is key to identifying lessons and assessing their applicability for others.
13. As shown in Annex II, not all members responded to requests for information or completed the survey, and there are differences in the degree to which members set out such information on their public websites. Nor is it certain that responses received in all instances reflect the view of the overall evaluation function or of the individual that provided the response and whether such individuals were always best placed to provide accurate evidence on the position and experience of their evaluation function. However, the analyst's opinion is that these limitations fundamentally undermine the conclusions drawn. While there are undoubtedly errors in what is presented across the individual members, for many of the non-respondents adequate evidence was found under steps (a) and (b) identified in paragraph 8 above. Second, limited triangulation was possible through use of the survey responses and discussion with key informants. Third, because as is shown in the exploratory analysis below, there is adequate data from the majority of the memberships on when the context probably makes institutionalising this relationship a sensible thing to do. On the other hand, a lack of responses from many of the UNEG members

⁵ Prom-Jackson, S. and G. A. Bartsiotas (2014) Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system. JIU/REP/2014/6. https://www.unjiu.org/en/reports-notes/JIU%20Products/JIU_REP_2014_6_English.pdf.

that currently have not institutionalised consideration of evaluative evidence by their governing body means that description of why this has not been done is not comprehensive and more work is needed to explore the implications of their divergent contexts.

III. The current status of institutional arrangements in place within individual UNEG members for providing evaluative evidence to governing bodies

14. A summary of the current status across the 47 UNEG membership is presented in Table 1 below. However, it is important to bear in mind that the institutional factors included in the table below do not represent a set of normative standards that all members are committed to putting in place. Rather, the purpose of the below analysis is to understand the current status of the individual members and start to explore why there may be differences.
15. The members have been grouped in Table 1 as follows:
 - a) Members where a comprehensive set of institutional arrangements are in place and evidence is provided by the organization's own evaluation function.
 - b) Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements are in place for reporting by the organisation's evaluation function but are subject to evaluation by OIOS which has the mandate for evaluating and reporting on these organisations' performance to the Committee for Programme and Coordination of the General Assembly. The assumption therefore being explored is that this means the context and ability of the evaluation functions to directly engage with their organisation's governing body is severely restricted for many of these organisations.⁶ In turn, this would affect the applicability of lessons on what works, because the context is too different (basic issue of external validity).
 - c) Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place, but OIOS has no role in evaluating the organisation's performance. The working assumption here would be why institutionalisation has not happened in these instances.
16. Overall, as shown in Table 1, across the membership:
 - Approximately a third (19 members) have comprehensive institutional arrangements in place where the evaluation office within the organisation provides the evaluative evidence.
 - Another third (16 members) where systems for the regular consideration of evidence produced by the organisation's evaluation function are not institutionalised, but the organisation is subject to evaluation by OIOS.
 - The remaining 12 UNEG members where systems for the regular consideration of evidence produced by the organisation's evaluation function are not institutionalised but the organisation is not subject to evaluation by OIOS.
17. The tentative finding therefore is that for four-fifths of the UNEG membership institutional arrangements that allow the regular consideration of evaluative evidence by the governing body are in place, albeit in some instances the evaluative evidence is not provided directly by the organisation's own evaluation function.

⁶ On the other hand, some organisations, such as UNEP, which is UNEP is subject to evaluation by OIOS but it also reports to its Committee of Permanent Representatives.

Table 1: Summary of current status of institutional arrangements in place within individual UNEG members for providing evaluative evidence to governing bodies

[illegible]

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB or evaluation sub-committee that endorses organisation's strategy/budget	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee sometimes propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other				
12. UNEP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13. UNESCO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14. UNFPA	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
15. UN-Habitat	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes
16. UNICEF	Yes	Yes	Partial (main focus is functioning of evaluation system)	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
17. UNIDO	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
18. WFP	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
19. WHO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place for reporting by the organisation's evaluation function but subject to evaluation by OIOS								
20. DPKO-DFS	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial	No

[illegible]

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB or evaluation sub-committee that endorses organisation's strategy/budget	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee sometimes propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other				
34. UNECE	No	No	Partial	No	No	No	Partial	Yes
35. UNHCR	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial	Yes
Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place, but OIOS has no role in evaluating the organisation's performance								
36. CTBTO	No	No	No	No	No	No	No function	No
37. IMO	No	No	No	Ad hoc report	No	No	No	Approve impact evals planned
38. IOM	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial	Yes
39. OPCW	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
40. PAHO	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
41. UNAIDS	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial	No
42. UNCDF	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial	No
43. UNITAR	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Partial	In theory can but don't
44. UNV	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB or evaluation sub-committee that endorses organisation's strategy/budget	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee sometimes propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other				
45. WIPO	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
46. WMO	No	No	No	No	No	No	Partial	No
47. WTO	No	No	No	No	No	No	No function	No

IV. Findings

18. The purpose of this exploratory study is to identify structural issues that promote or hinder the use of impartial evaluative evidence for improved decision-making of the governing bodies of UNEG members. In this context, it is important to bear in mind that the 2016 UNEG Norms and Standards do not explicitly set out either a norm or a standard that requires that evaluation evidence or an assessment of functioning of the evaluation system must be presented by a UNEG member evaluation function to its Governing Body or that this be done on a regular basis. As such, a core question for organisations where such systems have not been institutionalised, is does it make sense for them to do this in the future?

For UNEG members that have institutionalised a system to provide regular evidence to their Governing Body

A. Institutional mechanisms in place

19. Table 2 summarises the extent to which the actions/systems considered part of the institutionalisation of approaches to regularly presenting evidence to a governing body are in place across the 19 members who regularly do so. Overall, the basic systems and approaches institutionalised by most (16 of the 19 organisations) appear broadly the same. For the remaining three, in the cases of ESCAP and ICAO, the more limited degree to which the full range of systems and activities has been implemented may reflect the fact that they are not regularly providing evaluative evidence for consideration by their respective Governing Bodies. This may make the need to institutionalise systems and approaches less necessary. Limitations in the degree to which OIOS have been able to implement and institutionalise the approach are reportedly due to issues of the capacity of the Committee for Programme and Coordination of the General Assembly. The 2009 Peer Review of OIOS, while dated, concluded that *'IED is operating in a relatively non-conducive environment for quality, in depth evaluations within the area of the GA. Neither the Fifth Committee nor the CPC can meet the expectation that evaluations are discussed substantively and that steering is based on evaluation results'*. There is no evidence that the capacity of either the Fifth Committee or the CPC has substantially grown in the intervening eight years. However, the author of this report has worked with several of the 16 organisations that have institutionalised these systems and approaches and notes that several have a similar perception of the capacity of their Governing Body, which suggests that this may be an incomplete explanation of OIOS' situation.
20. Discussion with key informants and also the survey responses indicate that the focus within such systems can vary (see Table 6 below that sets out the perceived priorities of the Governing Bodies). For instance, in some cases, most notably UNICEF, the focus is upon providing evidence to the Governing Body that the overall evaluation system, including the decentralised components, are operating effectively and management is using the evaluations. Others are much more focused on holding management to account for the implementation of recommendations from specific evaluations (for instance IFAD).

Table 2: Summary of the extent to which systems and actions are in place across the 19 UNEG members

Action	Number of 19 where system/approach is:		
	Fully implemented	Partially implemented	Not implemented
Governing Body or evaluation sub-committee sometimes propose evaluations during evaluation plan development	18	-	1
Regularly present evaluation evidence to Governing Body or evaluation sub-committee that endorses organisation's strategy/budget	17	-	2
Present corporate level evaluations to the Governing Body	16	1	2
Present an annual synthesis of evaluative evidence to the Governing Body	17	1	1
Present another form of analysis to the to the Governing Body	10	-	8
Evaluation recommendations are reviewed by the Governing Body or evaluation sub-committee?	14	1	4
System to report on implementation of recommendations to Governing Body or evaluation sub-committee in place	17	2	-
Is the central evaluation function independent	14	5	-

21. Findings below mainly draw on survey responses from the 14¹ of the 19 UNEG members where indications are that systems are in place and the use of evaluative evidence produced by the evaluation function institutionalised. These are set out at Annex IV. Probably the main limitation with the data presented below is the lack of data from the Governing Bodies on how they perceive performance or what their expectations are in terms of the use of evaluative evidence. An attempt was made to address this by reviewing the evaluation policies of individual organisations, but this was found not to work. This was because evaluation policies

¹ Responses from WHO were too incomplete to include in the analysis.

were either not publically available or outdated or because the policy document provided little discussion on the use of evidence by the governing body. This therefore meant that it has not been possible to triangulate views from both the supply and demand perspectives.

Table 3: Organisations that have institutionalised the regular presentation to, and consideration of evaluative evidence, by their Governing Body and whether responded to the survey

Organisation	Responded to the survey?
1. ESCAP	Yes
2. FAO	Yes
3. GEF	Yes
4. IAEA	Yes
5. ICAO	Yes
6. IFAD	Yes
7. ILO	Yes
8. OIOS	Yes
9. UNDP	Yes
10. UNEP	Yes
11. UNESCO	Yes
12. UNFPA	Yes
13. UNICEF	Yes
14. UNIDO	Yes
15. WHO	Yes
16. UN-Habitat	No
17. UN Women	No
18. UNCTAD	No
19. WFP	No

B. Stages of the evaluation process where evaluation units engage with governing bodies

What kind of institutional arrangements with governing bodies might enable evaluation units to address the demand for evaluative evidence in a timely and credible way?

22. Given that evaluations take time to both design and carry out, the starting point to delivering evaluations on time to inform decision points is the evaluation planning process. Review of evaluation policies suggests that evaluation functions aspire to strike a balance between providing evaluations actively wanted by the Governing Body and those that the evaluation function, or senior management, see as a priority. Whilst all evaluation functions will have a planning process, evidence summarised in Table 1 tentatively indicates that for most of the organisations where the approach is institutionalised, the degree of involvement of the Board and instances of the Board suggesting issues for evaluation is greater than found across the wider UNEG population. What is unclear is which way causality runs in instances where the evaluation function has access to its Governing Body.
23. Outside the formal budget and work planning process, these evaluation functions have used two main methods to identify demand:
 - Informal consultations with Board members between Board meetings either face to face or via email; and/or
 - Review of Board discussions and discussion of concerns raised during engagement with the Board.
24. At least in terms of meeting needs as identified by their Governing Body, the evidence from the 13 would suggest that more than half of the surveyed evaluation units believe they can normally predict what the Board wants. Only two – OIOS² and UNEP – indicated that they are rarely able to predict what their Governing Body will want, which possibly reflects less opportunity to engage with their Governing Body client on a regular basis or a lack of capacity/interest within the Governing Body to provide such information. In addition, in the case of organisations such as UNICEF where the main demand is for evidence that the evaluation system works than for specific evaluations, this is less of an issue.

² OIOS, which does not invest significantly in engaging with the Standing Committee in development of its work programme has instead adopted a risk based approach for identifying which programmes get evaluated when, within an understanding that all programmes get evaluated within an eight year cycle.

Table 4: Degree to which evaluation functions find that they can predict what evaluations are wanted by their Governing Bodies and should be incorporated into their evaluation plans

How often can you effectively predict what the Board wants and incorporate this into your evaluation work plan?		
Normally	Sometimes	Rarely
FAO	ESCAP	OIOS
GEF	ICAO	UNEP
IFAD	ILO	
UNDP	UNESCO	
UNFPA	UNIDO	
UNICEF	IAEA	

25. Table 5 attempts to examine whether the ability to produce what is wanted by the Governing Body is reliant upon what type of evaluation product is prioritised by the Governing Body. The assumption here is that unless senior management or the Governing Body has endorsed a plan for implementation of a specific policy or programme, in most cases predicting ex ante at what point the Governing Body will want to evaluate a policy or programme is difficult to identify. On the other hand, the focus within an annual synthesis should be easier to predict, given that annual syntheses often include a mixture of information tracking set issues over time (such as performance of the evaluation system). The tentative conclusion is that this does not seem, at least for the 13 organisations, to appear to be a significant factor.

Table 5: Examination of whether the most important evaluation product to a Governing Board affects the ability of the function to predict what the Governing Body wants in the evaluation plan

Organization	Based on the function's experience, what is the most important evaluation product for your Governing Board?				
	Independent assessment of the degree to which the overall evaluation system is operating effectively (both evaluations carried out by the evaluation function and decentralized evaluations)	Evaluations that provide evidence to inform specific decisions (such as replenishment or reform processes)	Evaluation syntheses that codify learning from evaluation in a particular area	Evaluation recommendations	Regular assessments by the evaluation function of whether recommendations have been implemented, or not
Can normally predict what wanted					
1. FAO		✓			
2. GEF		✓			
3. IFAD				✓	
4. UNDP	✓				
5. UNFPA	✓				
6. UNICEF	✓				
Can sometimes predict what wanted					
7. UNIDO			✓		
8. ESCAP		✓			
9. ICAO					✓
10. ILO		✓			
11. UNESCO	✓				
12. IAEA				✓	

Organization	Based on the function's experience, what is the most important evaluation product for your Governing Board?				
	Independent assessment of the degree to which the overall evaluation system is operating effectively (both evaluations carried out by the evaluation function and decentralized evaluations)	Evaluations that provide evidence to inform specific decisions (such as replenishment or reform processes)	Evaluation syntheses that codify learning from evaluation in a particular area	Evaluation recommendations	Regular assessments by the evaluation function of whether recommendations have been implemented, or not
Can rarely predict what wanted					
13. OIOS				✓	
14. UNEP	✓				

26. Nor does the ability to predict appear closely linked by the degree to which the evaluation function is focused on delivery of evaluative evidence to inform decision points for specific strategic processes, where it might be assumed that the timing of the decision point should be known well in advance.

C. Products and breadth of evaluations presented to the governing bodies

27. Table 6 below suggests that for UNEG members that have institutionalised systems, this means presentation of a wide range of evaluative products for consideration by their Governing Body. The more limited range of products presented by UNICEF can be explained by the focus by the Governing Body on the functioning of the evaluation system (reported through the annual synthesis product) while the UNFPA system is still under development and it is possible that it will soon resemble that of most of these organisations. The cases of ICAO and ESCAP probably reflect the fact that they don't regularly present evaluative evidence to their Governing Bodies.

Table 6: Types of evaluative product delivered to the Governing Body

Organization	Type of evaluative evidence presented:		
	Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other
1. FAO	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. GEF	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. IFAD	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. UNDP	Yes	Yes	Yes
5. UNFPA	Yes	Yes	None
6. UNICEF	Yes	Partial (main focus is functioning of evaluation system)	None
7. UNIDO	Yes	Yes	None
8. ESCAP	No	Biennial	None
9. ICAO	Partial (for information)	None	None
10. ILO	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
11. UNESCO	Yes	Yes	Yes
12. IAEA	Yes	Yes	Yes
13. OIOS	Yes	Yes	Yes
14. UNEP	Yes	Yes	Yes

D. Ensuring credibility

28. Experience on ensuring the credibility of evaluative evidence across the thirteen reveals a number of themes common across many of themes summarised in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Themes on ensuring the perceived credibility of evaluative evidence with a Governing Body

Theme	Flagged by which evaluation function?
Ensure that the evaluation is adequately resourced	ESCAP, IFAD, ILO, OIOS,
Ensure that carried out by credible and professional team to deliver a high-quality evaluation	ESCAP, FAO, OIOS, UNDP, UNFPA
Engage the Board during the evaluation process and discussion of findings	ESCAP, FAO, GEF, IAEA, ICAO, ILO, UNESCO, UNDP, UNIDO
Communicate with senior management	IAEA
Ensure that some flexibility in overall budget and work plan to respond to changes	GEF
Ensure that direct and trusting relationship between the evaluation function and the Governing Body that supports independence	GEF, ILO
Ensure that evaluation analysis is strategic	ICAO, UNEP
Follow up on evaluation recommendations	IFAD
A good evaluation policy	IFAD, UNICEF
Use risk based approach to evaluation programming or make sure the evaluation plan is strategic	OIOS, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNIDO
Focus on formative evaluation to feed into key strategic decision making process	UNEP
Deliver on time	UNDP
Ensure that evaluations are publically available	UNIDO

E. Uptake of evaluations

29. Responses to the survey indicate that nearly all evaluation functions either agree (six organisations) or strongly agree (six organisations) that their Governing Body's demand for evaluative evidence is increasingly driven by the need to access evaluative evidence to inform specific strategic decisions. The two organisations where this increase is not observed are OIOS and UNICEF. As mentioned before, in OIOS' case, this possibly indicates the continued lack of capacity in the Committee for Programme and Coordination. For UNICEF, it appears to reflect the focus of the Executive Board on overseeing that the evaluation systems operate as intended and the evidence is used by management, rather than on results from specific evaluations.

30. Table 8 sets out where evaluation offices think that evaluation products have been used to inform specific strategic decision making processes and so forms the basis for exploring what evidence there might be on the utility of these evaluative products with the Governing Bodies and senior management.

Table 8: The link between strategic processes and provision of evaluative evidence

Organization	Strategic Process that link evaluation to:			
	Replenishment	Major organisational reform initiative	Agreement of strategic plans	Agreement of specific organisational policies
1. FAO	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. GEF	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. IFAD	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. UNDP	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
5. UNFPA	No	No	Yes	No
6. UNICEF	No response	No response	No response	No response
7. UNIDO	No	No	Yes	Yes
8. ESCAP	No	Yes	No	Yes
9. IAEA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
10. ICAO	No	No	No	Yes
11. ILO	No	No	Yes	Yes
12. UNESCO	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
13. OIOS	No response	No response	No response	No response
14. UNEP	No	Yes	Yes	No

What type of institutional arrangements within governing bodies facilitates the uptake of evaluations?

31. One interviewee summarised the challenge as follows 'Governing bodies are typically made up of members who are overworked and trying to deal with a wide range of complicated and challenging issues. In essence, they often don't have time to deal with evaluation (itself often perceived as complicated and difficult). This is especially true of members from the global South but is also increasingly true of Northern governments whose staff have been cut back and may not have time and resources to focus on evaluation material'. While this would align with the author's experience, I have not been able to find any material discussing the capacity of Governing Bodies to fulfill their roles.

32. Although the relevant UNEG members have institutionalised broadly the same approach, views on the issues that constrain Board members ability to take advantage of these systems vary, as shown below.

Table 9: Challenges identified for Governing Body members utilising evaluation evidence

Issue	Identified in which agency
Lack of time available to discuss with the Governing Body	UNFPA, UNESCO, UNEP, OIOS, ILO
Turnover of members and so challenges maintaining their understanding of use of evaluations	UNICEF, OIOS, ILO, FAO
Capacity of Board members to review	GEF, OIOS
Board members give low priority to evaluation	UNICEF, OIOS, ICAO
Evaluative evidence not presented in succinct and accessible format	IAEA, UNIDO, UNICEF, FAO
Evaluations using non-credible evidence sources	UNIDO
Not tracking implementation of recommendations	UNFPA
Lack sufficient budget	UNEP, ICAO
Evaluative findings not linked with planning processes or strategic issues	OIOS, FAO
Audits have more credibility and evaluations too positive	IAEA

33. A common observation is that formal Governing Body sessions are too structured and formal to allow a quality discussion of evaluative findings and recommendations and also don't allow evaluators the time to develop the understanding of Board members on evaluation. A response found in some organisations therefore is to place more stress on investing in informal briefing of Board members and the constituencies. While this was thought important in some organisations, perhaps surprising, was the number where the evaluation office did not think informal briefing more important for enhancing effective use of evaluations.

Table 10: Degree to which respondents agree that for effective use of evaluation evidence, informal briefing of Board members and constituencies is more important than discussion in the formal Board session

For effective use of evaluation evidence, informal briefing of Board members and constituencies is more important than discussion in the formal Board session.	Organisation
Strongly agree	IAEA, ICAO, IFAD, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNIDO
Agree	ILO, OIOS, UNEP
Disagree	ESCAP, FAO, GEF, UNICEF
Strongly disagree	UNDP

F. Reporting on implementation of evaluation recommendations to governing bodies

34. Table 1 evidence would tend to suggest that the main accountability mechanism used to foster use of evaluations through the Governing Body is the tracking system that allows the regular reporting of the status of implementation of recommendations accepted. However, a system for reporting recommendation implementation may be necessary to bolster accountability, but is not sufficient on its own. This is clearly shown in Table 11, which sets out factors respondents considered important in ensuring that recommendations are implemented.

Table 11: Critical factors enhancing senior management's commitment to implementation of recommendations discussed by your governing body

Organisation	Most important of the three	Middle most important of the three	Least important of the three
ESCAP	Institutionalization of management response and follow-up to recommendations	Engagement in the evaluation design and implementation	NA
FAO	High ownership	Strong evidence	Positive political economy
GEF	Formal management response system and tracking of implementation of recommendations by IEO	Consultative approach between IEO and management in discussing recommendations	Open discussion about implications of alternative recommendations
IAEA	Direct reporting to member states	Informal discussions with member states	Communication with senior management
ICAO	This is an objective in their performance review	When they see good ideas	NA
IFAD	Political will	Good quality of recommendations	Endorsement of the Executive Board
ILO	Commitment to evaluation at highest level	GB members requests for action	Better evaluation and more synthesis
OIOS	Board supports recommendations by ensuring/providing adequate resources to implement	Senior managers buy-in to recommendations and prioritizing them for action	Governing body demanding report / review of implementation within reasonable time frame
UNEP	Management committed to improvement and recommendation implementation	Recommendation compliance is reported to governing body	Evaluation processes aim at building ownership for recommendations
UNESCO	recommendation follow-up by the evaluation office	standing item on the agenda of the SMT	annual consultation
UNDP	Strong language of Board decision	NA	NA
UNFPA	Detailed presentation and discussion of evaluation	Engagement and support of OED	Improvements in coordination of the management response

Organisation	Most important of the three	Middle most important of the three	Least important of the three
	results in the Executive Committee		
UNICEF	Good understanding of evaluation processes and requirements	Pressure from Board members and donor expectations/requirements	Clarity in articulation of recommended actions and addressing of recommendations to appropriate persons
UNIDO	accountability and results orientation culture (=strong evaluation culture)	Respect for IEO	Professionalism

UNEG Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place, but OIOS has a role in evaluating the organisation's performance

35. Organisations that have not institutionalised this system have been grouped into those that are, and are not, subject to evaluation by OIOS. The working assumption is that for many such organisations, the space and opportunity may not exist for the organisations' evaluation functions to also report to the committees of the General Assembly. The lack of institutionalisation found across many of these organisations (see Table 1) would tend to suggest that this assumption is possibly broadly correct. However, the current situation would suggest that it doesn't apply in all cases; for example in UN Women, UNEP and ESCAP.
36. In addition, of the five members of this group that responded to the survey - see Table 12 below - four responded positively when asked if *'evidence and/or recommendations from evaluations or evaluation syntheses are regularly considered by your governing body'*. These positive responses reflected two issues. First, since the question did not specify who needed to provide the evaluation evidence to respond yes, and given that OIOS has an evaluation mandate, responding yes is technically correct for all these organisations.

Table 12: UNEG Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place, but OIOS has a role in evaluating the organisation's performance and whether responded to the survey

Organisation	Responded to the survey?
1. DPKO-DFS	Yes
2. ITC	Yes
3. OCHA	Yes
4. UN DPI	Yes
5. UNRWA	Yes
6. ECA	No

Organisation	Responded to the survey?
7. ECLAC	No
8. ECWA	No
9. OHCHR	No
10. UN DESA	No
11. DGACM	No
12. DSS	No
13. PBSO	No
14. UNODC	No
15. UNECE	No
16. UNHCR	No

37. Second, in practice, the governance context for these organisations is more complex than for the broader UNEG membership. For instance:
- Some such as UNWRA have established donor-groupings with whom they engage and discuss evaluative evidence. Such groupings don't have a direct role in over-sight, but given the overall results focus of donor countries (see MOPAN for example), they allow some over-sight, all be it indirect, by some member countries.
 - For some members, such as those in the humanitarian system, it makes sense for strategic evaluations to focus on the policy and performance of the system as a whole, rather than single organisations. This gives their evaluation functions the opportunity to participate in such system-focused evaluations which may be discussed by the member states.
 - Some such as UNHCR, have an Executive Committee, established under a General Assembly resolution, that covers many of the over-sight roles of a Governing Body.
38. The implications for UNEG moving forward is the need to recognise that for members where OIOS has a role, it should **not** be assumed that lessons on what works in the wider membership, will apply in the context of these specific members. On the other hand, discussion with some of these members and material reviewed suggests that members' organisations have developed a number of approaches to how they facilitate the consideration of evaluative evidence by groupings that could be seen as having some form of advisory or partial over-sight role.
- UNEG Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place and OIOS has no role in evaluating the organisation's performance**
39. There are 12 other members where systems are not institutionalised, but OIOS has no role, as summarised above. Of these 12, in two cases, UNV and UNCDF, discussion of the performance of the evaluation function, but not the results from specific evaluations, is included in the Annual Report produced by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office that is considered by the UNDP Executive Board on an annual basis. As such, a link is institutionalised, all be it indirectly. In two other organisations, the Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization and WTO there is no evaluation function. By definition, if there is no

evaluation function, then the basic condition necessary for regularly sharing evaluative evidence with the Governing Body, namely an evaluation function that produces such evidence, is not in place.

40. Across the remaining eight organisations, it is challenging to judge whether the institutional context suggests that all should actively consider attempting to institutionalise the consideration of evidence produced by the organisation's evaluation function and, if so, what lessons should be drawn from the experience of the 19 members who already have done so. As illustrated in Table 13, the impression is that these organisations face significantly different contexts.

Table 13: Reasons for why some members might not have moved to institutionalise the regular consideration of evidence produced by their evaluation function

Organisation	Reason why may not have moved to institutionalise the regular consideration of evidence produced by their evaluation function
1. IOM	Practice is that individual donors will commission their own evaluations if they believe needed.
2. PAHO	Single evaluation officer reporting to the PAHO Executive Director, so neither the capacity or mandate to report to the Governing Body.
3. UNAIDS	Approach in place that draws more on approach to evaluation observed in the vertical funds. A Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group, with membership from donors, civil society, member states and cosponsors tasked with promoting the use of evaluation internally and incorporating evaluation into programme development and strategic planning. Internal evaluation function of UNAIDS doesn't report directly to the MERG.
4. UNITAR	Institutionalisation under consideration, triggered by review of the evaluation policy.
5. WMO	Board gives low priority to evaluation function providing it with an independent and impartial assessment of the organisation's results
6. IMO	Evaluation is of low priority and currently just evaluates the results of training investments.
7. OPCW	Evaluation function is part of internal oversight. In 2012 policy, explicitly states that internal over-sights role is to support the Director-General.
8. WIPO	According to the 2016 Evaluation Policy, evaluations completed by the Internal Oversight Division are sent to the Independent Advisory Oversight Committee. Committee members are Board members serving in their personal capacity. As such, there is an institutional link to the Governing Body but operates differently from that seen elsewhere.

41. It would appear that UNAIDS and WIPO have systems in place that link evaluation with their respective governing bodies, but these operate differently to those found elsewhere. In UNITAR some development of an approach to institutionalisation is being considered. In the remaining cases, it appears that there is neither pressure from management or the Governing Body to prioritise evaluation.
42. In summary, across these eight UNEG members, the initial evidence does not suggest that for most, lessons learned across the 19 organisations that have institutionalised their approach will be relevant.

V. Implications for UNEG's future work on enhancing evaluation use

43. The objective of the study was to identify structural issues that promote or hinder the use of impartial evaluative evidence for improved decision-making of the governing bodies of UNEG members and so contribute to learning on practices and/or institutional arrangements that support use of evaluations to inform strategic choices and decisions.

For UNEG members that have institutionalised a system to provide regular evidence to their Governing Body

44. The findings in Section IV would suggest that lessons and practice found in the 19 members that have institutionalised systems and approaches may not have great relevance for most of the other members. This is mainly because the context is probably too different in many cases (because the opportunity to link with the Governing Body isn't there), the organisation has an alternative system in place that meets this need, or the need is not prioritised by the key stakeholders involved.
45. While as illustrated in the ToR and the broader literature there has been work on the use of evaluative evidence, little exists on the use of evaluative evidence by governing bodies rather than senior managers and what constitutes good practice in such contexts. The assumption is that the roles and responsibilities of the members of a governing body, even when called an Executive Board, should differ from those of an organisation's senior management. Therefore what evaluative evidence they might require and how it would be used might also differ.
46. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** De facto, an explicit theory, drawing on empirical evidence, for how Governing Bodies would use evaluative evidence is lacking. This study provides some of the empirical evidence required to plug this gap, as it sets out what has been done to institutionalise the availability of evidence. What is now required is to explore the degree to which the over-sight role of Governing Bodies means that how they use such evidence differs from that of senior managers. Obvious differences include: (a) capacity, expertise and time availability of Governing Body members; (b) knowledge of the organisation and so the relevance/feasibility of recommendations; and (c) the fact that the Board's role is oversight and not management decision making. It should then be possible to explore whether supply and demand are aligned and develop an explicit theory based on the empirical evidence.
47. Across the 19 members where systems and approaches have been institutionalised, these look broadly similar at first sight.
48. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** Nevertheless, key informant interviews, the survey responses, and the personal experience of the author all show that in fact there is a diversity across these organisations in terms of their context and what is prioritised in these systems. Before drawing out lessons it would be good practice to consider whether, and what, contextual factors affect which lessons will be relevant to which members.
49. This study has drawn a distinction between organisations where there is institutionalised systems for consideration of evaluative evidence by the Governing Body relative to organisations where this has not occurred. This does not mean that it should be assumed that institutionalisation necessarily leads to greater use of evaluative evidence by senior management; those who are ultimately responsible for implementing change.
50. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** This is an assumption that may need to be examined by UNEG. Looking forward, this scoping study has identified both which organisations have institutionalised the use of evaluative evidence by a Governing Body and how they have done so. However, before drawing lessons, good practice would be to examine whether this really has been a necessary condition for enhanced use of evaluation evidence and findings by senior management, and also whether or not sufficient and in what contexts. In particular, interviews

and anecdotal evidence suggests divergent views on the degree to which management response systems and systems reporting implementation of recommendations are truly effective in enhancing use rather than gaming of the system by senior management. This will be challenging, since the main analysis of use across the UN is the JIU's³ 2014 which notes that *'It was realized during the scoping for the study that, while anecdotal evidence exists, the assessment of the impact from the use of evaluation and its products by the various organizations was almost non-existent'*. Given the resource implications, this would suggest the need to use a case based approach to getting the evidence of use needed to examine the question.

UNEG Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place, but OIOS has a role in evaluating the organisation's performance

51. Where OIOS has an evaluation mandate, the context and ability of the evaluation functions to directly engage with their organisation's governing body appears severely restricted. This may be because the General Assembly and its subsidiary committees consider that OIOS provides sufficient evaluative evidence to meet their needs, but also the fact that OIOS' own experience is that the capacity of such committees to consider evaluative evidence may be limited anyway. This in turn strongly suggests that it would be difficult to directly transpose lessons from those UNEG members that have institutionalised such systems and approaches. On the other hand, there are indications that at least for some of these organisations, there is consideration of evaluative evidence by bodies that depending upon the organisation carry out some of the over-sight functions of a conventional Governing Body.
52. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** A potential next step would be for UNEG to carry out analysis within this group to classify the various oversight approaches found and hence the opportunities, and limits, imposed to enhancing the use of evaluative evidence through these over-sight mechanisms. At this point it would be possible to identify whether there are organisations within this group that could draw on the lessons and experience of UN Women, UNEP and ESCAP which are nominally part of the Secretariat but where aspects of over-sight have been delegated by the General Assembly to an Executive Body and so it has been possible to institutionalise consideration of evaluation evidence by an over-sight body.
53. Allied with investment in examining the use of evaluative evidence, as proposed above, this would provide the evidence base to draw out lessons that relevant to the varying contexts of these UNEG members.

UNEG Members where no, or few, institutional arrangements in place and OIOS has no role in evaluating the organisation's performance

54. For the 12 organisations where OIOS has no oversight role but they haven't institutionalised consideration of evaluation evidence by the Governing Body, again there is little evidence to suggest that there would be much sense or opportunity to transfer lesson from those that have institutionalised an approach. It would appear that UNAIDS and WIPO have systems in place that link evaluation with their respective governing bodies, but these operate differently to those found elsewhere. In UNITAR some development of an approach to institutionalisation is being considered. In the remaining cases, it appears that there is neither pressure from management or the Governing Body to prioritise evaluation.
55. ***Suggestion for consideration by UNEG:*** In conclusion, it does not appear that UNEG would have a comparative advantage in addressing the needs of these organisations in this area or developing relevant lessons. Their contexts are too specific.

³ Prom-Jackson, S. and G. A. Bartsiotas (2014) Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system. JIU/REP/2014/6. https://www.unjiu.org/en/reports-notes/JIU%20Products/JIU_REP_2014_6_English.pdf.

Annex I: Terms of Reference of the study

A. Background

1. Over the past years the work of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) has contributed to a better understanding of the factors that enable use of evaluation in the United Nations system. In 2015, a study was commissioned on the use of evaluation (Evaluation Use in the UN System: Conclusions from the Data⁴) that identified the following aspects as critical to enhance the use of evaluations: users and stakeholders should be consulted throughout the evaluation process; evaluators need to ensure that recommendations are relevant and feasible; **the support of senior decision-makers is key, as is their commitment to the implementation of recommendations** management responses and follow-up processes need to be institutionalized; and, sharing of evaluation findings should promote cross-organizational learning.
2. The United Nations system is, however, not alone in having a low level of performance regarding the use of evaluation to influence decisions, and turn learning into action. Studies conducted on the Use of Evaluations in the Norwegian Development Cooperation System (2012) and on the Use of evaluation Results in the European Commission (2005) identified similar crucial factors in fostering the use of evaluation: the timing and the purpose of the evaluation; support of the senior management; the quality of the evaluation process and the evaluation report; and the monitoring and follow-up of evaluation recommendations. The findings suggest that a concerted effort is needed to address the problem and enhance understanding of the value of the function.
3. Another study of the Evaluation Function in the United Nations system also found that the use of evaluation reports for their intended purposes is consistently low for most organizations.⁵ Even organizations in which the evaluation function is considered to perform well manifest, only an average level of use of reports by the intended audience. Low level of use is associated with an accountability-driven focus and the limitations noted above on the role of the function in the development of the learning organizations. There is a need to improve the systems in place for assessing the use of evaluation. Likewise, better systems are needed for assessing the impact on organizational effectiveness in using evaluation. Currently, the systems used to assess that impact are rudimentary and ad hoc. A number of factors identified in the study are under the direct control of evaluation offices in the UN system. However, there is one aspect that goes beyond the control of the evaluation offices that has important implications on the behaviour of senior decision makers in the UN system, and that is the governance structure and the mandate for the conduct of impartial and evidence-based evaluations.
4. It is widely recognised that evaluation is a learning tool and, through a feedback loop, can help the United Nations to become a learning system. In general, there is now enough resource dedicated to collecting and evaluating evidence but it is dissipated across the organisations. Although individual parts of the United Nations system have their own lessons and learning systems, the learning culture across the United Nations system is underdeveloped which means that the United Nations as a whole is not gaining maximum benefit from the experiences of its constituent parts. The challenges to establishing this sort of learning-focused evaluation are the overlapping and fragmented portfolios across the organisation; different priority and accountability frameworks; and a plethora of different oversight mechanisms.⁶
5. At its Annual General Meeting in 2016, UNEG decided to focus its efforts on ‘the support of senior decision-makers, and their commitment to the implementation’ as one of the most critical

⁴ United Nations Evaluation Group (2016). Working paper Evaluation Use in the UN System: Conclusions from the Data. New York: UNEG.

⁵ Joint Inspection Unit. Analysis of the Evaluation Function in the United Nations System. Geneva 2014.

⁶ Wilton Park. Delivering a well-managed and effective UN: building international consensus. Conference report. 2012.

and yet not fully explored factors affecting the use of evaluation. As part of this focus and as approved in its programme of work 2016-2017, UNEG is commissioning an exploratory study on the implications of the governance structures of UNEG members in promoting the use of evaluative evidence for informed decision-making.

B. Objectives

6. The purpose of the exploratory study is to identify structural issues that promote or hinder the use of impartial evaluative evidence for improved decision-making of the governing bodies of UNEG members.
7. The study will contribute to learning on practices and/or institutional arrangements that support use of evaluations to inform strategic choices and decisions. Specific lessons are expected around issues such as:
 - What kind of institutional arrangements with governing bodies may enable evaluation units to address the demand for evaluative evidence in a timely and credible way?
 - What type of institutional arrangements within governing bodies facilitates the uptake of evaluations?
 - Which types of accountability arrangements are more likely to foster demand for evaluative evidence?
 - What evidence is there from UNEG members that evaluations have informed major strategic decisions, such as replenishments, reorganisations or others?
 - What types of evaluations and evaluation products are suitable to inform executive decision-making?
 - What breadth/scope of evaluation is the most relevant and useful for decision-making by senior managers and governing bodies?
 - What do senior managers and governing bodies' members consider as critical factors hampering or, conversely, enhancing their commitment to implementation of recommendations?

C. Approach and Scope

8. **Defining evaluation use.** Over the past 40 years, various theories of evaluation utilization have been presented and debated, including the identification of factors that may affect utilization. Based on the theoretical literature, evaluation utilization can be classified into five types⁷:
 - *instrumental* when decision makers use the evaluation findings to modify the evaluand (i.e., the object of the evaluation) in some way.
 - *conceptual* when the evaluation findings help program staff understand the program in a new way.
 - *'enlightenment'* when the evaluation findings add knowledge to the field and thus may be used by anyone, not just those involved with the programme or evaluation of the programme.
 - *Process* when cognitive, behavioural, programme and organizational changes resulting from engagement in the evaluation process and learning to think evaluatively.

⁷ Dreolin N. Fleischer and Christina A. Christie. Evaluation Use - Results From a Survey of U.S. American Evaluation Association Members. American Journal of Evaluation Volume 30 Number 2, June 2009 158-175.

- *Persuasive or symbolic* when the evaluation is used to persuade important stakeholders that the programme or organization values accountability as an example of persuasive or symbolic use. It can also refer to a case where an evaluator is hired to evaluate a program to legitimize a decision that has already been made prior to the commissioning of the evaluation.
9. **Factors affecting evaluation use.** Literature also identifies a range of factors that affect utilization. These factors can be broadly categorized into two groups: (i) characteristics of the evaluation—the way that the evaluation is conducted; and (ii) characteristics of the organizational setting in which findings are to be utilized—factors within the organization in which the evaluation is conducted.⁸ In the context of this study, the second set of factors will be explored. As Bob Picciotto has put it: What matters most in evaluation use is the organizational and cultural context within which evaluation is conducted and whether it is auspicious to organizational learning.⁹
 10. **Evaluation systems.** A given governance structure and policy setting constitute the context in which different functions of evaluation can be observed. Evaluation systems ‘are embedded in organizational procedures of verification and undergirded by organizational responsibilities’, which implies that an evaluation system, together with other organizational procedures, may fulfil a ‘verification function’. Evaluation systems produce routinized information for single-loop learning (a learning function). Systems are largely used as providers of (procedural) assurance (a legitimatizing function). They produce information that confirms, rather than questions, policies (a substantiating function), and evaluation systems that breed evaluation (a ‘growth function’). Evaluation systems with a deficient learning function can lead to ‘tunnel vision’.¹⁰
 11. Evaluation cannot fulfil its potential unless it connects effectively to its management, the supreme authorities that govern the organization and the broader society. Important organizational and strategic decisions are collective decisions shaped by hierarchy, protocols and precedent. Through independent evaluation, organizational learning and individual learning are bridged.¹¹
 12. Within the United Nations system, each of the constituent entities has some legal or practical degree of independence. The specialized agencies are independent in formal, legal terms. Many of the funds, programmes and other entities that report to the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General are semi-independent, owing to their separate governing bodies, which play an essential role in their funding. Experience with evaluations within the United Nations system to date has shown that it is important to: (a) have a commissioning body who not only commissions but also follows up on the evaluation and ensures implementation of the recommendations; (b) establish mechanisms to ensure balanced stakeholder engagement in the process; (c) set up a system to ensure impartial and professional management of the process and the conduct of the evaluation; and (d) set up a secretariat function to manage the process and day-to-day activities.¹²
 13. **Scope.** The study would cover the following structures: the UN General Assembly and its relationship with the use of evaluation including through the Joint Inspection Unit and the

⁸ Drawn from ADB paper on Maximizing the Use of Evaluation Findings, prepared by John Scott Bayley (no date).

⁹ Robert Picciotto. Evaluation Independence In Organizations. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*; Volume 9, Issue 20, 2013.

¹⁰ Anders Hanberger. The real functions of evaluation and response systems. *Evaluation*, 17(4), 2011.

¹¹ Robert Picciotto. Evaluation Independence In Organizations. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*; Volume 9, Issue 20, 2013.

¹² Policy for Independent System-wide Evaluation of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System. June 2013.

Office of Internal Oversight; the UN Security Council; the ECOSOC; the Governing bodies and Executive Boards of the Specialized Agencies, Funds and Programmes, as well as any special arrangements for specific UNEG members not covered in the list above (Annex I - A). As can be seen in the organogram of the UN system, the different governing bodies of the UN entities, have differentiated approaches to the use of evaluative evidence.

14. **Limitations.** Limited information is available on the use and impact of evaluation reports. Some organisations track the adoption of recommendations, which is however a weak indication of evaluation use. As Osvaldo Feinstein¹³ has pointed out, there are some typical pitfalls in the evaluation of the use of evaluations. One of them is due to the existence of lags, to a ‘gestation period’ for the occurrence of use. It might seem that there is no evidence of use and therefore no use. Another source of pitfalls is the attribution problem: one can find things that have been done after the evaluation was completed in a way consistent with the evaluation’s recommendations. The fact that there is consistency between the evaluation findings and recommendations and what was done after the evaluation is not necessarily an indication of use (post hoc fallacy).

D. Methodology

15. The methodology would be based mainly on desk review, an online survey on evaluation use among UNEG Members supplemented with a few interviews of UNEG members, senior managers and governing bodies, and case studies of “influential evaluations”. To the extent possible evaluation functions outside of UNEG, e.g. at bilateral aid organisations and IFIs, will also be asked (through survey and interviews) to provide their perspectives on the role and use of evaluations within the UN system. The study would start with a desk review to mapping the distinctive characteristics of the governing bodies with respect to the use of evaluative evidence and the corresponding structure for receiving evaluative feedback from operations.
16. Activities for data collection will include:
 - i) Literature review and preliminary discussions (with UNEG thematic group and governing body secretariats amongst others) to identify key assumptions on governance structures that would promote the use of evaluative evidence and in which contexts.
 - ii) Contact UNEG members with request for examples of factors, including governance related aspects, that promoted the use of evaluative evidence.
 - iii) Conduct a number of case studies on the utilization (or non-utilization) of evaluations by governing bodies, aiming to develop a set of hypotheses that could be tested.
 - iv) Selected interviews with members of governing bodies and senior managers.
 - v) Conduct survey with the wider UNEG membership aimed at testing whether the hypotheses tested above are valid in their experience.
 - vi) Discussion with the UNEG membership on which of the hypotheses to take forward in further work.

E. Inputs and timeframe

17. The resources available for the study are:
 - 20.000 USD as per approved UNEG work programme and budget 2016-2017;
 - A dedicated UNEG working sub-group comprised of representatives of the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), the office of evaluation at ILO, the evaluation unit at UNITAR and the independent office of evaluation at IFAD (convener).
 - The deadline for the completion of the study is January 2017 for internal discussion.

¹³ Osvaldo Feinstein: Use of Evaluations and the Evaluation of their Use. *Evaluation*, 2002.

- A draft discussion paper will be submitted to the SO2 working group by end of January 2017.
- The final report will be presented at the UNEG Annual Meeting in May 2017.

F. Requirements/profile of the consultant

18. The requirements for the consultant are the following:

- Senior Evaluator (more than 10 years of experience in leading complex evaluations, including corporate-level evaluations and/or organisational evaluations in international development?).
- Experience with UN system-wide evaluations and/or evaluations of UN bodies.
- Strong communication and writing skills.

3 November, 2016

Annex II - A. UNEG as of June 2016: 47 members and 3 observers, Secretariat hosted by UNDP IEO

- ❖ Funds & programmes: ITC UNCDF UNICEF UNCTAD UNHCR UNDP UN-Women UNEP UN-Habitat UNODC UNFPA UNRWA UNV WFP (14).
- ❖ Specialized agencies: FAO ICAO IFAD ILO IMO UNESCO UNIDO WHO WIPO WMO (10).
- ❖ Related, associated and other organizations: CTBTO IAEA OPCW WTO IOM UNAIDS (6).
- ❖ Regional commissions: UNESCAP UNESCWA UNECA UNECE UNECLAC (5).
- ❖ UN Secretariat Departments & offices: OCHA OHCHR OIOS DPI DPKO UNDESA PBSO DGACM UNDSS (8).
- ❖ Research and training institutes: UNICRI, UNITAR (2).
- ❖ Others: GEF PAHO (2).
- ❖ Observers: JIU SDG-F World Bank.

Annex III: Overview of what evidence provided directly by individual UNEG members

✓ = Evaluation function provided complete evidence

i.c. = Incomplete response received

Organization	Organisation verified data in Annex I	Organisation provided responses to survey
CTBTO		
DPKO-DFS	✓	✓
ECA		
ECLAC		
ECWA		
ESCAP	✓	✓
FAO	✓	✓
GEF	✓	✓
IAEA		✓
ICAO	✓	✓
IFAD	✓	✓
ILO	✓	✓
IMO		
IOM	✓	✓
ITC		✓
OCHA		✓

✓ = Evaluation function provided complete evidence

i.c. = Incomplete response received

Organization	Organisation verified data in Annex I	Organisation provided responses to survey
OHCHR		
OIOS	✓	✓
OPCW		
PAHO	✓	✓
UN DPI	✓	✓ (ic)
UN DESA		
UN Women	✓	
UNAIDS		✓
UNCDF		✓(ic)
UNCTAD	✓	
UNDP	✓	✓
UNECE		
UNEP	✓	✓
UNESCO	✓	✓
UNFPA	✓	✓
UN-Habitat		
UNHCR		

✓ = Evaluation function provided complete evidence

i.c. = Incomplete response received

Organization	Organisation verified data in Annex I	Organisation provided responses to survey
UNICEF	✓	✓
UNIDO	✓	✓
UNITAR	✓	✓
DGACM		
DSS		
PBSO		
UNODC		
UNRWA	✓	✓
UNV		
WFP	✓	
WHO	✓	✓
WIPO		
WMO		✓ (ic)
WTO		✓

Annex IV: Analysis of the degree to which UNEG members have formal systems in place that manage the presentation and use of evaluative evidence by the member's governing body

Please note that given that governance structures and terminology vary across the UNEG membership, below we request that you understand that a Governing Body is the body that endorses the strategy/corporate plan and budget of the organisation and hence logically would make the most strategic use of evaluative evidence.

Evidence to complete the below table was drawn from the following sources:

- i. Descriptions for the individual UNEG members found on the UNEG website;
- ii. A brief review of material found on the evaluation function's own website and documentation presented at recent meetings of the organisations' Governing Bodies;
- iii. Responses from the individual members. Please note that not all responded to our request to correct any possible mistakes in material drawn from the two sources above.
- iv. For independence, evaluation functions were rated as independent if they had been judged to be transitioning to level 4 or were at 4 or above in the JIU's recently (2014) completed assessment of evaluation functions. For functions that were not included in the JIU sample, evaluation policies were assessed where necessary to check if independent or not.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
1. CTBTO	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No function	No
2. DPKO-DFS	No	None	None	None	No.	No	No	Partial	No
3. ECA	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	Requests some
4. ECLAC	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	Approves eval plan
5. ECWA	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	Sees the plan
6. ESCAP	ESCAP reports to its member States through the annual Commission sessions a biennial report on findings and results of evaluative activities at ESCAP. In	All evaluative activities	All evaluative activities	None	?	Considered by member States during ESCAP commission sessions.	Both evaluation report and management response, including follow-up action plan, is accessible by member States	Partial	Yes, Through a resolution, member States mandate the secretariat (ESCAP) to

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
	addition, and as part of the biennial programme budget preparation, ESCAP also reports to the UNGA the results of all evaluative activities						and uploaded in the ESCAP website		conduct an independent evaluation on certain topic.
7. FAO ¹	Yes	Corp. level evaluations and corresponding Management Response (MR)	Programme Evaluation Report (PER),	In addition to corp. level evaluation, the PC	Currently, there is a <u>formal mechanism</u> through the	Yes	Yes, the Follow up reports to the implementation of the accepted and agreed	Yes	OED's proposes, Programme Committee approves and

¹ Independent evaluation of the evaluation function in FAO is planned to be conducted in 2015 to 2016 for the Committee's consideration in the second half of 2016. Check whether presenting to Nov 2016 Programme Committee meeting.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
Peer Review 2012 ²	Regularly to the Programme Committee of GB (12 expert representatives from member countries). Council (inter-governmental executive organ represented by forty-nine member countries) sometimes request for some corporate level evaluations	summated and reviewed by Programme Committee (PC). Currently each Strategic Objective of the Organisation is under evaluation. SO5 was the first one, presented to the 120 th PC session. Both Evaluation Report and MR	inter-alia synthesizing evidence from evaluation reports, submitted and reviewed by Conference every two years.	requests synthesis reports to be presented to them (i.e. planning a synthesis of lessons learnt in application of the Country Prog. Framework for 2nd half 2017).	Programme Committee sessions held twice a year. Informal meetings have been requested in the latest 120 th PC session (Nov 2016). This mechanism will be implemented		recommendations in the MR.		requests any additional evaluations not initially proposed.

² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1191>.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
	i.e. decentralized offices evaluation) to be presented directly to them. These are reviewed by Programme Committee prior to presentation to Council.	are discussed internally in the Evaluation Committee (composed of senior management representatives) prior to submission to the PC session. Follow up report to MR (in principle 2 yrs after MR) also			d from now on, ensuring informal meetings twice a year before the PC session.				

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		submitted and reviewed by PC							
8. GEF 2014 Peer review ³	IEO presents to the Council semi-annually all completed evaluations. GEF Secretariat is required to present the management responses thereto. Council endorses the evaluations and follow-up actions.	All evaluations carried out by IEO using consultants as required.	The Annual Performance Report (APR) is intended to provide a detailed overview of the performance of GEF activities and processes, key factors	4 yearly Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF. Overall Performance Studies undertaken every 4 years to inform donors prior to replenishment of the	Apart from regular evaluation sessions in semi-annual Council meetings, IEO informs the Council through informal ad hoc meetings throughout	Recommendations reviewed by Council as the evaluations are presented formally. Council endorses recommendations (sometimes modifying them) following presentation of management response and discussion.	In consultation with the appropriate GEF partners, the GEF IEO and the GEF Secretariat report to the Council on the follow-up of Council decisions; these decisions and follow-on actions are compiled in a management action record provided to the	Yes	Yes, Council endorses the work program of IEO following consultations.

³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1624>.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			affecting performance, and the quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems within the GEF partnership. Draws on terminal evaluations of recently projects.	GEF. Council considers OPS a key document in discussing programmatic directions for next replenishment. Intended to provide independent assessment of	the year. The IEO website (www.gef.ieo.org) now provides real-time progress on all evaluations.		Council on an annual basis		

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			Provides ratings on project outcomes, likelihood of sustainability, and quality of M&E. APR usually has an in-depth analysis of specific performance dimensions that change	performance and results, as well as institutional and governance issues, over a GEF replenishment period. Note OPS 6 on-going and will be presented to the Council in 2017, so would need to look at					

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			from year-to-year.	experience with OPS5.					
9. IAEA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	No	No	Yes	Yes
10. ICAO	Council (The Assembly approves the Organization's budget every 3 years.)	A summary evaluation report that includes the management responses in an Annex are presented to the Council as Council information working papers	None	None	No, the meetings are formally tabled	ICAO has an Evaluation and Audit Advisory Committee which scrutinises management responses to evaluation. They are also scrutinised by the Council, but	The implementation of recommendations is reported to Council systematically at the level of the Evaluation and Internal Audit Office (EAO). Such a report includes evaluation, internal	Partial	Consulted

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		(Council can scrutinise the evaluation, as well as the management responses despite its presentation in an information working paper that in practice means that no decisions need to be made on the basis of such a paper). Full evaluation reports are placed on the secure Council website. There				not by the Assembly	and external audit recommendations		

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		is no public access to evaluation reports.							
11. IFAD	Evaluation committee that reports to the EB	Evaluation Committee performs in-depth reviews of selected project evaluation reports and all impact evaluations and higher plane evaluations	Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations Evaluated in 2015 (ARRI) discussed by the EB. Draws on ratings from	IOE is invited to provide written comments on country strategies and corporate policies which have been subject of previous	?	No	President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA), which includes comments from IOE.	Yes	Evaluation Committee reviews the plan and budget. Endorsed by the EB

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		such as CSPEs and CLEs. EB reviews CSPEs and corporate evaluations.	completed projects and also some synthetic work.	evaluations					
12. ILO Independent evaluation of ILO evaluation function ongoing	YES	Each year the Evaluation Office produces High Level evaluations (strategy and DWCP evaluations)' as a GB document. Topics for evaluations have been identified by the GB in	Each year the Evaluation Office produces an annual evaluation report which includes information on the performance of the	EVAL systematically promotes the use of evaluations. This is done, amongst other measures, by regularly undertaking	NO- It is very formal	Yes Recommendations and follow up are reviewed by the GB. The Evaluation Advisory Committee is responsible to ensure managers to evaluation follow-up seriously. The directors of units concerned by	November session of the GB every year and through quarterly meeting of the EAC. The Annual Evaluation Report includes annex setting out actions taken to implement recommendations set out in the	Reporting line to DG and Governing Body.	GB endorses the rolling evaluation plan and can make requests for future evaluation topics. The topics for inclusion in the workplan are based on inputs from the Evaluation

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		consultation with EVAL and the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC). The GB discusses the report and approves its recommendations. These recommendations are then reviewed for follow-up by the Evaluation Office with the Evaluation Advisory	evaluation office as measured against its strategy and an overview of project evaluations, recommendations and their follow up. The report also has a section that reviews	g evaluability assessments, synthesis reviews and meta-studies, and by pulling together findings from evaluation reports. Synthesis reviews are		corporate evaluations are called to relevant sessions to respond and inform EAC on the follow up and status to recommendations. EAC can request for strengthened follow up by line managers and it stays on the agenda of the EAC until EAC members are satisfied the recommendations	previous annual reports.		Office, the EAC; the ILO constituents (workers, employers and governments) as well as specific rotational evaluations such as the corporate evaluation on regions.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		Committee which meets quarterly.	and reflects on selected aspects of strengthening the overall effectiveness of the Office in implementing its Strategic Policy and includes reflections on preparations for subsequent	prepared annually to feed into the International Labour Conference's recurring discussions of a major labour topic on which the ILO works.		has been implemented.			

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			evaluation s. The report also includes an update of steps taken by the Office in respect of the rolling action plan for the implementation of the recommendations contained						

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			in previous annual evaluation reports, as well as an updated list of approved and proposed high-level evaluations for future years.						
13. IMO	No	None	None	Ad hoc report	?	No	No	No	Approve impact evals planned
14. IOM	No	None	None	None	Yes at their request, which can	No	No	Partial	No, but any specific request from

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
					also include formal presentations at GB sessions				GB will be added to the plan
15. ITC	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	Joint Advisory Group may suggest
16. OCHA	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No	No
17. OHCHR	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No	No
18. OIOS	OIOS presents corporate or programme-level evaluations of Secretariat entities	OIOS presents a synthesis of evaluation results in its			For reports presented to IGBs, inter-governmental bodies can	Both the Department of Management of the UN Secretariat and OIOS systematically	Partial	Yes	OIOS

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
	to the Committee for Programme and Coordination and the Fifth Committee (i.e. the Administrative and Budgetary Committee). Reports to the General Assembly may also be reviewed by other relevant inter-governmental bodies. in the past OIOS submitted one evaluation (on protection of civilians) to the UNGA Fifth Committee, and	annual report to ACABQ https://oios.un.org/page?slug=annual-reports			choose to endorse or reject, or as desired, through their deliberations on the information provided by the evaluation, formulate their own recommendations, which upon resolution by the General Assembly,	monitor the implementation of evaluation recommendations. Monitoring reports are regularly sent to the Governing Body of the organization.			

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
	one on ICTY to the Security Council. In May, it will submit another report on Strategic Deployment Stocks to the UNGA Fifth Committee. These are isolated cases, mostly occurring out of a specific request.				become mandates which the subject programmes will have to implement. For example, past IED reports have supported decisions to restructure programmes (DPKO and DFS) as well as increase				

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
					resources (DPA)				
19. OPCW	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No	No
20. PAHO	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No	No
21. UN DPI	No	None	None	None	The UN Committee on Information (DPI's GB) can request evaluations. When a request is made, findings and recommendations of the evaluation are shared	No	No	Partial	No, they make requests for evaluation at the time of the annual meeting of the Committee on Information

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
					through the regular reports of the Dep., not through informal meetings. They can request a separate evaluation report but have not exercised this option in recent years.				

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
22. UN DESA	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No	No
23. UN Women 2014 Peer Review ⁴	Yes, to our Executive Board (1 annual and 2 regular sessions/year)	Summary for corporate evaluations and respective management responses are presented to the Board through its regular sessions.	Annual evaluation report. Focused on results in four main areas of work: Corporate evaluations, decentralized evaluations, UN coordination	The results of corporate evaluations informed the midterm review of the UN Women Strategic Plan in 2016. In addition, they fed	Partially. IEO participates in both informal sessions and regular sessions of the Executive Board. Since 2013, the UN Women Evaluation	In discussing individual evaluations presented to the GB.	All evaluations are publicly available on the Global Accountability and Tracking of Evaluation (GATE) system along with their management responses. The Annual report draws from GATE to report on implementation of recommendations.	Partial.	Eval plan presented to GB. GB can request specific evaluations be done. IEO prepares the Strategic Plan and Corporate Evaluation Plan (CEP) for consideration

⁴ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1626>.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			gender-responsive evaluation, national evaluation capacity. Since 2014, the Annual Report has a KPI and a section on evaluation use.	into UN Women's efforts to promote a stand-alone gender equality goal in the post-2015 development framework.	Advisory Committee (GEAC) acts as a forum for the Executive Director and the IEO to further ensure the independence, relevance and quality of its evaluation function and promote their use within UN				of the Senior Management Team and the Global Evaluation Committee. The Global Evaluation Committee then makes recommendations to the UN Women's Executive Director to approve it. The Independent Evaluation

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			Since 2013, IEO produces annual meta-analyses drawing on evidence from both corporate and decentralised evaluations. The results of these meta-analyses are also included in		Women. The GEAC meets annually.				Office finalizes the Plan taking into account the comments of senior management and the Global Evaluation Committee, for the Executive Director's approval. The approved plan is shared with the Executive Board, and reporting on its implementati

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			the Annual Report.						on is included within the annual report of the evaluation function.
24. UNAIDS ⁵	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	No
25. UNCDF	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	No

⁵ Only evaluations that have been considered by the GB were the 1st and 2nd independent evaluations. Nothing therefore since 2010.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
26. UNCTAD	Yes, once a year to the Working Party on the Strategic Framework and Programme Budget, which reports to Trade and Development Board (TDB), the GB of UNCTAD, including annual corporate level evaluation plan for the approval by member States.	Yes, both full report in 6 UN official languages, respective management responses, and the evaluation team would present evaluation findings and recommendations to the annual meeting of Working Party. Member States review and discuss the evaluation. Follow-up to	Yes, evaluations conducted in the previous year would be reported to member States in 6 UN official languages, before the annual meeting of Working Party. Member States review and	None	No, formal meeting	Yes, both recommendations of corporate level evaluation and all other evaluations.	Programme manager needs to report to the GB progress made in implementing the recommendations, at the following year's Working Party.	Partial	The GB has the ability to also propose evaluations. The evaluation function proposes evaluations to the GB through a risk-based approach.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		evaluations is also presented to the Working Party.	discuss the synthesis report and findings at the annual meeting.						

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
27. UNDP	Executive Board	Independent thematic and programmatic evaluations are submitted to the Executive Board (EB),	Annual report on evaluation (ARE) (both short EB paper and full report) covering highlights from UNDP/UN CDF/UNV evaluations and quality assurance of UNDP decentralized	Evaluation of the UNDP strategic plan, 2008-2013 Evaluation of UNDP Strategic Plan, Global and Regional Programmes 2014-2017 will be presented to the EB in	Both formal and informal meetings	Management responses to thematic evaluations are prepared by the chief executive and presented to the Executive Board.	Reported by management in response to the IEO Annual Report In future, there is a plan to develop a mechanism to follow up on implementation of recommendations from independent evaluations, reported to EB	Yes	EB approves the evaluation plan.

2013 Peer review ⁶ Independent review of evaluation policy 2014 ⁷			evaluation s	September 2017.					
28. UNECE	No	None	Lessons reported biennially in Secretary- General's Programme	None	?	No	No	Partial	Approves eval plan

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			Performance Report						
29. UNEP	Yes	Evaluations of entire organisation - None (part of the OIOS mandate). Evaluation Office undertakes evaluations of corporate functions e.g. Strategic planning,	Biennial synthesis report, includes analysis across project portfolio evaluations and short summaries of corporate	Formative Evaluation of the Medium-Term Strategy 2014-2017 was presented to the Committee of Permanent Representatives	Committee of Permanent Representatives (Formal Sub-committee of UN Environment Assembly)	High level evaluations presented – general MS feedback given but recs not formally reviewed	Biennial synthesis report (will soon feature on website)	Yes	Approves eval plan

⁶ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1632>.

⁷ [http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/review/Baasterl-UNDP-Evaluation PR 2014.pdf](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/review/Baasterl-UNDP-Evaluation_PR_2014.pdf).

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		programme co-ordination	evaluations.	(CPR) and UNEP Senior Management in April/May 2015.					
30. UNESCO	Yes	Yes	Annual report on evaluation that summarises key evaluations' conclusions and recommendations	Synthetic Review of Evaluations in the UNESCO System produced in 2016 with a view to providing	No	Yes, in that included in the annual report on evaluation	The IOS Evaluation Office monitors progress by reporting to the Executive Board annually on the status of implementation of corporate and joint/system-wide	Yes	Approves eval plan, and, <i>inter alia</i> , nominates topics

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			dations and concludes with suggested GB resolution.	comparative data to the Governing Bodies to support decision-making on strategic directions and the allocation of human and financial resources of the Organization, notably at the level of			evaluation report recommendations.		

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
				UNESCO's ERs					
31. UNFPA	Executive Board	All corporate thematic evaluations are presented to GB. Not all corporate prog. and joint evaluations are presented to the GB (In total 2 out of 4 corporate evaluations presented to GB in 2015/16)	Annual report (but light on substantive content and doesn't specify corporate evaluation recommendations)	None	?	Recommendations and MR of all corporate thematic/institutional evaluations are presented to GB. Not all corporate programme and joint evaluations are presented to the GB (2 out of 4 corporate evaluations presented to GB in 2015/16)	Annexed in the annual report	Yes	Approves eval plan

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
32. UN-Habitat	UN-Habitat Board and the Committee of Permanent Representatives.	None	Evaluation results and lessons from evaluations are synthesized in a biennial evaluation report, which is presented to the UN-Habitat Board and the Committee of Permanent	None	?	Draft management response Corporate level evaluations focus on strategic evaluations of organizational policies, strategies, and themes with a global perspectives are reviewed by other relevant entities and finally approved by the UN-Habitat Board.	The Evaluation Unit provides regular briefings to the UN-Habitat Board on the performance of evaluation in UN-Habitat, including six monthly updates on the progress of implementation of evaluation recommendations.	Partial	Approve the evaluation plan

2012 Peer review ⁸			Represent atives.						
33. UNHCR	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	Consulted
34. UNICEF 2013 Synthesis report on eval policy ⁹ Note UNICEF	Executive Board	3 corporate level evaluations presented to the Board – i.e. one for each session of the Board, plus an	EO produces 2 evaluation synthesis reports each year on thematic/s	Evaluation Policy formally approved by Board. Also, some evaluation s are	Board is informed of evaluation results etc at each of 3 formal Board sessions,	No	In the annual report. Also, internal quarterly monitoring report circulated to management for information and follow up.	Yes	Senior management consulted during preparation of the evaluation plan for global thematic

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
appears an outlier with stronger focus on decentralised evaluation		Annual Report on the evaluation function. This volume of delivery was at the request of the Board. Reports are only presented to the board when a management response has been completed – this is due within 2 months of completion of the report	ectoral topics, which do have recommendations. The annual report on the evaluation function does not include recommendations but management provides	occasionally presented informally to Board members	preceded by 3 informal Board briefings. (internal) evaluation committee (senior management) meets twice a year at formal side meetings of the global				evaluation. The plan is signed off by the evaluation director for endorsement by the internal evaluation committee and the Executive Board.

⁸ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1164>.

⁹ http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF_Synthesis_Report_Revised_Final.pdf.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		but can take longer. Why selected?: titles proposed to Board Bureau and included in Board calendar (rationale: evaluations which are interesting or especially relevant)	(at request of the Board) a "management perspective".		management team				
35. UNIDO	YES At two levels:	Summary / Briefings of all corporate level or strategic evaluations (E.g.	Every 2 years a report on evaluation activities	None	Bi-annual briefings for Member States representati	No	System in place to track Level of acceptance of recommendations and level of	Yes	GB have the option to propose evaluations during the

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
	To Executive Board (EB) → A synthesis (IOM) from each Evaluation.	Thematic Evaluations, Country level evaluations)	is formally issued to the IDB. Every 4/5 years, a synthesis of all evaluations is conducted and reported.		ves on evaluation findings and recommendations		implementation one-year later. Summary presented to GB in briefings and report		planning of the 2 year evaluation work-programme. GB can also propose evaluations at any time, and provide the budget as needed.
36. UNITAR	Yes, but not regularly	NA* *In theory yes, in practice no due to resource capacity constraints over	NA* *In theory yes, in practice no due to resource	Programme Performance Report	No, it is through formal meetings of the GB.	NA* *In theory yes, in practice no due to resource capacity constraints. Our M&E Policy	No	Partial	No, in practice proposed evaluations are proposed by the Planning, Performance and Results

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
		the past years which have recently been increased following a recommendation of the GB. Our M&E Policy Framework requires the corporate evaluation reports to be submitted to the GB through the Executive Director of the Institute.	capacity constraints . Our M&E Policy Framework requires the corporate evaluation reports to be submitted to the GB through the Executive Director of			Framework requires the corporate evaluation reports to be submitted to the GB through the Executive Director of the Institute			Section (our Evaluation Office) and the Executive Director. However, the GB can in theory make any recommendations to management.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			the Institute.						
37. DGACM	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No function	No
38. DSS	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No	No
39. PBSO	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No function	No
40. UNODC	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	Non-costed annual plan presented to GB
41. UNRWA	The GB does not endorse the organization strategy or budget (less than two percent of the budget are assessed)	yes to the executive office and in addition to the Advisory Committee on Internal Oversight: The committee	yes to executive office and in addition to the a) Advisory Commissio	None	Strategic evaluations are formally shared with the management committee of UNRWA	Management responses requested from the client of the evaluation which in most cases for strategic	Recommendation status is part of the Annual report of the oversight function which is shared with a) Advisory Commission, b)	Partial	Plan is endorsed by the Executive Office and the Advisory Committee on Internal Oversight

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
	<p>contributions the GB only determines the assessed contribution)</p> <p>Evaluation regularly presents evaluation evidence to the Executive Office which is the only part of the governance structure to approve the strategy and budget.</p>	advises the Commissioner General on oversight matters but would not get involved into programmatic or strategic issues of the Agency.	<p>n: advises the Commissioner General and consists of host and donor government representatives</p> <p>b)Advisory Commission Subcommittee:</p>		including the executive office as well as with the Advisory Committee on Internal Oversight Services	evaluations is the executive office.	Advisory Commission Subcommittee, and c) Advisory Committee on Internal Oversight Services		Services and presented to the Advisory Commission.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			Programmatic discussions are held and informal advise is given to the organization c)Advisory Committee on Internal Oversight:						
42. UNV	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No	

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
43. WFP Following a Peer review, ¹⁰ WFP's Evaluation Function has been significantly strengthened through the adoption of a new Evaluation Policy 2016-	Executive Board	All centralized evaluations ¹¹ commissioned and managed by the Office of Evaluation and their management responses ¹² are submitted to WFP Executive Board for consideration. Decentralized	The Board considers Annual Evaluation Reports (AERs). The AER is the primary instrument for reporting on WFP's entire Evaluation	Synthesis of series of evaluations, e.g. Annual synthesis from the Operations Evaluation series	Roundtable Sessions: to be held roughly two weeks before each Board formal session to allow for more in-depth discussions of evaluation reports.	From Centralized Evaluations and Annual Evaluation Reports	The Board considers management responses to all the evaluations presented, and reports on follow-up action. In line with the new Evaluation Policy, management responses to all evaluation recommendations	Yes - the Director of Evaluation heads an independent evaluation function within the WFP Secretariat. See Peer Review findings for more details.	The OEV work plan is elaborated independently by the Director of Evaluation, in consultation with WFP senior management and other key stakeholders, and presented to the Board

¹⁰ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1623>.

¹¹ With the exception of the current series of operation evaluations, for which an annual synthesis is presented.

¹² Through annual performance reports and annual reports on the implementation status of evaluation recommendations.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
2021, a Corporate Evaluation Strategy 2016-2021 and an Evaluation Charter issued in May 2016; the new model for WFP evaluation function combines centralized evaluation with demand-led decentralized		evaluations are not presented to the Board but published on WFP external website.	Function, and presents synthesized findings, lessons and recommendations from Office of Evaluation (OEV) reports (centralized evaluation managed by OEV), grouped under	(2013-2016) Synthesis of Impact and Strategic evaluations (ad-hoc)	There are 3 roundtable sessions on evaluation per year with the EB, one of which being the Annual Consultation on Evaluation held in May, to consider progress on implementation of the Evaluation Policy and effectiveness of WFP's		are publicly available and appropriate follow up actions are taken and reported annually to the EB. WFP's corporate database and Annual Report on follow up to evaluations, managed by the Performance Management and Monitoring Division Management Division (RMP), will be modified to include all WFP evaluations.		as part of WFP's Management Plan.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
evaluation. it implies			thematic areas. It identifies systemic issues and makes overarching recommendations. From 2016 onwards, the Annual Evaluation Report also reports on a select		entire evaluation function; review OEV's work plan and priorities and approve OEV's budget as part of WFP's Management Plan.				

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			number of Key performance indicators (KPIs) that facilitate oversight of progress towards each Outcome and associated workstreams as elaborated in the Evaluation						

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			<p>Policy and Corporate Evaluation</p> <p>Strategy; other KPIs are reported internally to the Evaluation Function Steering Group composed of WFP senior</p>						

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
			managem nt.						
44. WHO	Yes	Yes	Annual evaluation report includes brief (1 -2 para summaries of evaluation conclusion s and follow up of recommen dations).	yes, summaries of corporate and decentraliz ed evaluation s and follow up of recommen dations as back-of-the room document at the EB	No, through formal reports but in addition, member states' briefing through information sessions	Through the Annual Evaluation Report and specific evaluation reports as required by the GB	Reported annually by EVL to the Executive Board through the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee	Yes	Eval plan presented to GB. GB can request specific evaluations be done.

Organization	Do you regularly present evaluation evidence to GB that endorses organisation's strategy/budget or evaluation sub-committee	Type of evaluative evidence presented:			Main mechanism for informing the GB or Evaluation Committee is through informal meetings	Recommendations reviewed by GB or evaluation sub-committee?	System to report on imp. of recommendations to GB or evaluation sub-committee	Independent evaluation function?	GB or evaluation sub-committee propose evaluations during eval. plan development
		Corp. level evaluation	Annual synthesis of evaluative evidence	Other					
45. WIPO 2014 external assessment ¹³	Independent Advisory Oversight Committee (not sub-committee of GB)		Copied to WIPO Independent Advisory Oversight Committee	None	?	Copied to WIPO Independent Advisory Oversight Committee	Copied to WIPO Independent Advisory Oversight Committee	Yes	Member-states consulted in development of plan
46. WMO	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	Partial	No
47. WTO	No	None	None	None	?	No	No	No function	No

¹³ http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/about-wipo/en/oversight/iaod/pdf/eqa_report.pdf.

Annex V: The survey questions and summary of responses from UNEG members that have institutionalised the regular reporting and consideration of evaluative evidence by their governing body

Q2: From your evaluation function's experience, please identify and rank the relative importance to your Governing Body of the following evaluative products.

MI = Most Important

LI = Less important

	Organisation													
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA
Independent assessment of the degree to which the overall evaluation system is operating effectively (both evaluations carried out by the evaluation function and decentralized evaluations)		LI						MI	MI	MI	MI	MI		
Evaluations that provide evidence to inform specific decisions (such as	MI	MI	MI			MI		LI						

replenishment or reform processes)														
Evaluation syntheses that codify learning from evaluation in a particular area			LI	LI			LI						MI	LI
Evaluation recommendations					MI		MI				LI			MI
Regular assessments by the evaluation function of whether recommendations have been implemented, or not	LI			MI	LI				LI		LI			
Other												Executive Board is concerned to see that evaluation evidence is actually applied by the organization in policy formulation, programme design and		

												management etc		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------	--	--

Q3: In your opinion, what priority does your governing body give to the evaluation function providing it with an independent and impartial assessment of the organisation's results to meet accountability needs?

	Organisation													
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA
In your opinion, what priority does your governing body give to the evaluation function providing it with an independent and impartial assessment of the organisation's results to meet accountability needs?	Medium	High	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Low	High	Medium	High	Medium	High	High

Q4: Does your governing body make official decisions based on recommendations in evaluations presented to the Board?

	Organisation													
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA
Does your governing body	Always	Always	Always	Sometimes	Always	Sometimes	Always	Never	Always	Always	Sometimes	Never	Sometimes	Sometimes

make official decisions based on recommendatio ns in evaluations presented to the Board?														
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Q5: In your opinion, what priority does your governing body give to the evaluation function providing it with credible evidence that the organisation's managers are putting the lessons from evaluations produced by the evaluation function into practice.

	Organisation													
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA
In your opinion, what priority does your governing body give to the evaluation function providing it with credible evidence that the organisation's managers are putting the lessons from evaluations produced by the evaluation function into practice.	Medium	High	High	Medium	High	High	High	Medium	High	High	Medium	High	Medium	High

Q6: In your opinion, what priority does your governing body give to the evaluation function providing it with credible evidence that the organisation's managers are putting the lessons from decentralized evaluations into practice.

	Organisation													
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA

In your opinion, what priority does your governing body give to the evaluation function providing it with credible evidence that the organisation's managers are putting the lessons from decentralized evaluations into practice.	Medium	High	Medium	No response	Medium	Medium	Low	None	High	Medium	Medium	High	Low	None
--	--------	------	--------	-------------	--------	--------	-----	------	------	--------	--------	------	-----	------

Q7: From your evaluation function's experience, has your Board's demand for evaluative evidence been increasingly driven to inform specific strategic decisions?

	Organisation													
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA
From your evaluation function's experience, has your Board's demand for evaluative evidence been increasingly driven to inform	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Agree

specific strategic decisions?														
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Q8: Please identify, which of the following strategic processes have been supported by a synthesis of evaluative evidence or a specific evaluation?

	Organisation													IAEA
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	
Replenishment	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No response	No	No	No	No	No response	No	Yes
Major organisational reform initiative	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No response	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No response	No	No
Agreement of strategic plans	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No response	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No response	Yes	Yes
Agreement of specific organisational policies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No response	No	Yes	Yes	No	No response	Yes	Yes
Other		Reform of the organisation									still in the first round of corporate evaluations - evaluation evidence fed into the MTR of the SP and now		Programme level effectiveness, Medium term programme framework progress, impact assessment	

											into the new SP process. CPEs directly inform new CPDs - and this is one issue reviewed by the Programme Review Committee			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Q9: Can you effectively predict what the Board wants and incorporate this into your evaluation work plan?

	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNE P	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA
Can you effectively predict what the Board wants and	Sometimes	Normally	Normally	Sometimes	Normally	Sometimes	Rarely	Rarely	Sometimes	Normally	Normally	Normally	Sometimes	Sometimes

incorporate this into your evaluation workplan?														
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Q10: From your experience what are the best techniques for identifying what the Board wants?

Organisation	From your experience what are the best techniques for identifying what the Board wants?
ESCAP	No response
FAO	Discussion of the evaluation work-plan by the Board (ideally multiyear rolling work-plans, not just on a yearly basis)
GEF	Demand is discussed in formal GB meetings and the GB approves my annual work plan. I also consult with key GB members informally in between meetings.
IAEA	Direct communication with the Board
ICAO	Meeting with them and emailing
IFAD	Informal consultations
ILO	Online consultations with Governing Board members
OIOS	Telling them what they should want through presentation of an evidence and risk based work plan
UNEP	No response

UNESCO	follow Board discussions and planned future high level meetings; results-based reporting cycle
UNDP	Reading prior board decisions
UNFPA	Informal consultations
UNICEF	Board discussions of annual report on the function (both central and decentralised aspects); Regular consideration of formal Board decisions; informal conversations with key Board members; provide Board with proactive proposals
UNIDO	Evaluation unit briefings to MSs

Q11: From your evaluation function's experience, please identify and rank by importance, the three most important actions that have enabled your evaluation function to address the demand for evaluative evidence by your governing body in a timely and credible way.

Organisation	Most important of the three	Middle most important of the three	Least important of the three
ESCAP	Obtain sufficient budget for conducting the evaluation	Engage a credible and professional evaluation team	Conduct a transparent and participatory evaluation process
FAO	Discussion of the work-plan and evaluation findings with the Board	Discussion of the work-plan and evaluation findings with Management	Maintenance of high-quality standards
GEF	Direct and trustful relationship between the GB and IEO (and its Director)	IEO reporting directly to the GB	Certain level of flexibility in allocating resources for evaluations (including a 4-year budget of IEO with annual tranches that can vary depending on work program)

IAEA	Direct reporting to the member states	Informal discussions with the member states	Communications with senior management
ICAO	Consultation with the Board	Strategic analysis	
IFAD	Annual work programme and budget	Existence of a clear Evaluation Policy	Follow up to evaluation recommendations
ILO	Enhanced independence of function	Sufficient resources	Dialogue with GB member
OIOS	Informing the Governing body of the inadequacy of the evaluation function to cover all subject entities in a reasonable time frame, resulting in more adequate resources for evaluation	Adopting a risk based approach to evaluation work planning, in the process informing the Governing body on what should be the priority topics	Capacity development of evaluation staff to meet quality standards of evidence
UNEP	Evaluation of Strategic Plans, planning processes and results frameworks (formative)	Synthesis and meta-analysis on a two-yearly basis	Evaluation of high level themes and cross-cutting issues
UNESCO	strategic orientation of evaluation plan	special sessions on evaluation results	including m/s in evaluation process
UNDP	Submitting reports that are valid to Board discussions	Maintaining informal contact with Board members	Timely submission
UNFPA	Development of the quadrennial evaluation plan	Improving quality of CPEs	Survey to senior staff CO/ RO/ HQ
UNICEF	Formulation and adoption by Board of a clear evaluation policy	Regular presentation of high quality evaluations and relevant evaluation evidence	Formulation and adoption of a clear plan for corporate evaluations
UNIDO	Conducting Programme level or Strategic Evaluations	Reporting and Briefing MSs systematically and periodically	Ensuring that Evaluation products are publicly available

Q12: Critical factors hampering senior management's commitment to implementation of recommendations discussed by the Board include:

Organisation	Most important of the three	Middle most important of the three	Least important of the three
ESCAP	No response	No response	No response
FAO	Low ownership	Weak evidence	Negative political economy
GEF	Competing priorities and views	Lack of control over key implementing partners	Lack of realism in GB decisions
IAEA	Objections of middle management	Weak culture of evaluation	Fear of clients
ICAO	Lack of time	Lack of motivation	Lack of resources
IFAD	Lack of political will	Different sense of priorities	Lack of financial resource
ILO	Evaluation culture still weak	Budget and political realities	Capacity of systems to adjust very slow
OIOS	Adequate resources - senior managers often cite the lack of resources to implement recommendations	Senior managers non-acceptance of the recommendations, resulting in 'documentary' compliance rather than real	Lack of follow-up mechanism to review / assure recommendations are implemented
UNEP	Lack of a specific Board sub-committee for board discussion of evaluation and audit recommendations	Intermittent engagement with the governing body (these survey questions all assume an active board role!!	
UNESCO	lack of financial and human resources		
UNDP	Allergy to any kind of criticism	Claim of resource limitations	Assumption that problems will go away

UNFPA	Overload - high number audit and evaluation recommendations	Limited attention to management response follow up by senior management. Though this is set to improve in 2017	
UNICEF	Highly decentralised evaluation function means that senior managers are often remote from Board decision making and more responsive to national priorities	Perception that it is only some Board members who are pushing for evaluation issues and implementation of recommendations	Focus on short term changes, "quick fixes" and "innovation" rather than medium term strategy and result
UNIDO	Too frequent change in Senior Management positions, without due process or proper care to competences for those positions	Weak leadership	degradation/weakness on results orientation and proper systematic monitoring

Q13: Critical factors enhancing senior management's commitment to implementation of recommendations discussed by the Board include:

Organisation	Most important of the three	Middle most important of the three	Least important of the three
ESCAP	Institutionalization of management response and follow-up to recommendations	Engagement in the evaluation design and implementation	
FAO	High ownership	Strong evidence	Positive political economy
GEF	Formal management response system and tracking of implementation of recommendations by IEO	Consultative approach between IEO and management in discussing recommendations	Open discussion about implications of alternative recommendations
IAEA	No response	No response	No response

ICAO	This is an objective in their performance review	When they see good ideas	
IFAD	Political will	Good quality of recommendations	Endorsement of the Executive Board
ILO	Commitment to evaluation at highest level	GB members requests for action	Better evaluation and more synthesis
OIOS	Board supports recommendations by ensuring/providing adequate resources to implement	Senior managers buy-in to recommendations and prioritizing them for action	Governing body demanding report / review of implementation within reasonable time frame
UNEP	Management committed to improvement and recommendation implementation	Recommendation compliance is reported to governing body	Evaluation processes aim at building ownership for recommendations
UNESCO	recommendation follow-up by the evaluation office	standing item on the agenda of the SMT	annual consultation
UNDP	Strong language of Board decision		
UNFPA	Detailed presentation and discussion of evaluation results in the Executive Committee	Engagement and support of OED	Improvements in coordination of the management response
UNICEF	Good understanding of evaluation processes and requirements	Pressure from Board members and donor expectations/requirements	Clarity in articulation of recommended actions and addressing of recommendations to appropriate persons
UNIDO	accountability and results orientation culture (=strong evaluation culture)	Respect for IEO	Professionalism

Q14: Challenges that constrain the governing body's ability to use evaluative evidence and/or maintain oversight of the overall evaluation system.

Q15: What has been done by whom to try address this constraint?

Organisation	Challenges that constrain the governing body's ability to use evaluative evidence and/or maintain oversight of the overall evaluation system.	What has been done by whom to try address this constraint?
ESCAP	No response	No response
FAO	Changes in Membership	Regular briefing of new Board members
	Length and complexity of reports	Simplify and reduce length of reports-increase their attractiveness
	Weak linkages with strategic issues	Align evaluation subjects to key strategic issues
GEF	Capacity of smaller delegations to absorb evaluation reports	Spreading presentation of evaluation and developing innovative knowledge products
	Physical meetings only semi-annually	Inter-sectional communications between GB and IEO
	Ability of all GB members to dedicate resources to management	Six-member Committee established and operational
IAEA	Audits more credible	Demonstrating that evaluations are evidence based
	Reports too long	Shortened reports (Body 35 pages max)
	Reports too rosy and flowery	Clear language
ICAO	Low level of oversight culture	Active communication by us and the oversight committee
	constrained resources	
IFAD	None (Evaluation sub-committee in place)	No response

ILO	GB members come and go	GB members network meetings to discuss and pass on knowledge
	Lack of understanding of what evaluations can do	Briefing sessions, newsletters, think piece series
	Number of times evaluation session is on the agenda in a year	
OIOS	Lack of dedicated capacity to review of evaluative evidence	While the General Assembly has created a dedicated capacity in the form of the Committee for Programme and Coordination to review evaluations, this committee is also responsible for various programme planning and monitoring matters; as such, it can only devote limited time to review of entire Secretariat and its entities.
	Lack of linkage between review of evaluation results and review of programme plans	There is a need to better sequence the review of evaluation reports with review of programme plans; this has not been done
	Interest, understanding and competency of Governing body members to review evaluation reports	An orientation session is provided before each Evaluation review session; however, this may not be adequate
UNEP	Lack of regular engagement with evaluation function	Audit committee has been proposed
	Constrained budget for higher level evaluation	MOPAN review of UNEP recommended discrete budget for Evaluation
	Insufficient time to discuss operational details	as in 1
UNESCO	lack of time to discuss reports	offer information briefings
	lack of time to prepare for discussions	one page summaries

UNDP	No response	No response
UNFPA	Limited tracking by EB on overall progress against EB decisions	EB to raise in 2017 sessions
	Lack of granularity in management response follow up reporting	Improvements planned in 2017 by management
	Time pressure - EO produces user friendly briefs to aid EB in distilling evaluation results	User friendly briefs
UNICEF	Lack of understanding of evaluation principles/processes	Briefing of new Board members; informal briefing of Board members before each formal Board meeting: jointly arranged by Evaluation Office and senior management
	Board members overwhelmed by other high priority responsibilities - often dealing with several agencies at once	Limited action taken by senior management to ensure smooth Board processes and early distribution of materials. But core problem is around UN Governance.
	Format of bulky evaluation reports etc.	Evaluation Office produces short presentations and short, attractive briefing papers
UNIDO	too much information and details	synthesis of evaluations prepared by evaluation unit
	misleading/misinformation from non-validated sources	n/a
	frequent changes and weaknesses of evaluation independence	Governing bodies expressing concern and recommending corrective action

Q16: For effective use of evaluation evidence, informal briefing of Board members and constituencies is more important than discussion in the formal Board session.

	Organisation													
	ESCAP	FAO	GEF	ICAO	IFAD	ILO	OIOS	UNEP	UNESCO	UNDP	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNIDO	IAEA
For effective use of evaluation evidence, informal briefing of Board members and constituencies is more important than discussion in the formal Board session.	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree

Q17: If you have an example of an evaluation product or practice that you think others across UNEG could learn from in terms of strengthening use of evaluation by a governing body, please identify it below.

Organisation	If you have an example of an evaluation product or practice that you think others across UNEG could learn from in terms of strengthening use of evaluation by a governing body, please identify it below.
ESCAP	No response

Organisation	If you have an example of an evaluation product or practice that you think others across UNEG could learn from in terms of strengthening use of evaluation by a governing body, please identify it below.
FAO	Follow-up reports (2 years after discussion of Management Response)
GEF	Management action record to monitor implementation of recommendations
IAEA	No response
ICAO	No response
IFAD	PRISMA - President's Report on the implementation status of evaluation recommendations and management actions
ILO	No response
OIOS	No response
UNEP	UNEP Formative Evaluations of the Programme of Work / Medium Term Strategy very influential on Senior Management and appreciated by Governing Body
UNESCO	Evaluation Policy
UNDP	No response
UNFPA	No response
UNICEF	Board members appreciate short evaluation synthesis reports, presenting evaluation evidence drawn together systematically from a larger body of evaluation material and presented at both informal and formal Board session
UNIDO	No response