

Decentralized Evaluation Functions Across UN Agencies

Mapping of Key Features



Introduction

Introduction: As part of its workplan for 2019-2020, the Decentralized Evaluation Interest Group (DEIG) has mapped the key features of the Decentralized Evaluation (DE) functions of various UN agencies/funds/programmes. This will be complemented subsequently by a series of short briefs documenting best practices on selected elements of the DE functions. The intent of this mapping exercise is to facilitate learning and sharing of experience across the various UN agencies. It is primarily meant to be an internal tool although upon completion of the exercise, DEIG members may explore the possibility of disseminating this document to a wider audience among the evaluation community. All inputs have been provided and consolidated by DEIG members, which were also responsible for highlighting good practices within their agency's DE function. Co-coordinators have also sought inputs from other UN agencies that are not members of the DEIG but have a mature DE function.

The following traffic light color coding indicates the level of maturity of development of each element/feature of the Decentralized Evaluation function of UN agencies/funds/programmes.

Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement
Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory or inexistent

	FAO	ILO	IOM	UN WOMEN	UNDP	UNESCO	UNFPA	UNICEF	UNRWA	WFP	WHO
Evaluation Planning	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement
Quality Assurance - Guidance	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement
Quality Assurance - process	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement
Quality Assurance – Post-Hoc Quality assessment	Unsatisfactory or inexistent	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement
Technical Support	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory
Capacity development	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Identification of evaluation teams	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Impartiality provisions	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Financial resources	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement						
Evaluation report repository	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory
Management Response	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Other initiatives/ systems to enhance use	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partially in place or requiring enhancement	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Contents

FAO	4
ILO	7
IOM	10
UN Women.....	15
UNDP.....	15
UNESCO	17
UNFPA	20
UNICEF.....	23
UNRWA	27
WFP	30
WHO	35



FAO

DEFINITION OF DE

A DE is an evaluation that is planned, managed and conducted outside the central evaluation unit.

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The Evaluation of the Evaluation Function (2016) recommended for mid-term evaluations to be decentralized. Starting from 2019, this was actively implemented.

A proposal for the decentralization of evaluations has been drafted for approval by FAO's Programme Committee (May 2020). If accepted, it will be implemented in 2021, and the Office of Evaluation will develop an Evaluation Policy during the second half of 2020.

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

DE are under the responsibility of the programme/ project manager (and not the Office of Evaluation). The evaluation must be conducted by an external team, who are hired and supervised by the Evaluation Manager (who if possible is not part of the programme/ project team). The Office of Evaluation has an advisory and quality support role.

According to the proposal on Decentralization (still to be approved by FAO Programme Committee), the following arrangements are envisioned:

- **Office of the Evaluation:** consolidates evaluation plans, including DE and prepare progress reports on implementation, including reporting on quality of project evaluations for the Programme Committee; develops and implements the evaluation capacity development programme; ensures capacity in place in support of DE both at HQ and in each of the ROs.
- The **FAO Programme Committee:** receives annual report on progress on the implementation of DEs; provides guidance to the Management based on evaluation results.
- **Regional Representatives:** advise on country offices' evaluation plan; oversee implementation of evaluation plan by country offices; ensure that planning for and subsequent use of evaluation is embedded in the RBM system and project cycle, including the necessary resources; consolidate regional report on the implementation of DE plans and report to FAO Evaluation Committee; ensure that Evaluation is a standing item in Regional Management Meetings.
- **Country Representatives and other Budget Holders:** develop an evaluation plan: appoint an evaluation focal point; have the final responsibility for the evaluation report and its dissemination; follow-up on recommendations of the evaluation with relevant stakeholders.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

Decentralized offices should identify evaluations which are coming up and finalize an evaluation plan. This will be based on the current requirements for project evaluations (all projects above USD 4M must be evaluated), and on prioritization by these offices, in consultation with the Regional Evaluation Officer. They should inform the Regional Evaluation Officer. The Office of Evaluation then consolidates evaluations plans.

The evaluations are planned according to the donor, FAO or project's requirements and needs.



QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) – GUIDANCE

The Office of Evaluation sets appropriate and realistic standards for DEs, while still reflecting the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, and the need for impartiality.

The manager of a DE is responsible for assuring the quality of the evaluation process and products. The Office of Evaluation can provide advice and guidance throughout the evaluation and will have a few reference materials for quality review of evaluations (i.e. questionnaires to guide the review).

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Quality assurance is the responsibility of the evaluation manager. The Office of the Evaluation intends to expand its capacity building activities to help ensure that these managers of DEs are appropriately trained and equipped for their roles. The system for quality support is described in two sections below.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT (PHQA)

It is planned to put such a mechanism in place, as follows: a post-hoc assessment system will assess all completed evaluations (both centralized and decentralized) against respective standards and report the summary of the assessment outcomes to the Programme Committee. This function will be sub-contracted to an external entity to ensure greater impartiality.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

We have developed a [Project Evaluation manual for decentralized offices](#). One evaluation specialist has been hired at the Latin America and Caribbean regional office, to support DEs. As per the proposal on DEs, outposted evaluation specialist positions are planned in the larger FAO regions. These will form outposted “evaluation teams” quality supporting DEs and managing country and regional level evaluations.

Currently: (i) support is requested from a decentralized office; (ii) the Office of Evaluation confirms the timeline and nominates a colleague who will support the evaluation (in the future these persons may be regionally-based); (iii) this person (Office of Evaluation focal point) guides and supports the DE on questions such as TORs, recruitment of evaluators, review of the evaluation report.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Actively took this upon in 2019 and continuing in 2020. Key components so far include:

- In person attendance of the Office of Evaluation’s staff to regional and sub-regional management meetings to understand the capacity needs, challenges and explain more the evaluation and DEs process;
- Webinars with a) high-level management of decentralized offices, and b) more operational-level staff. Contents of the webinars for the latter group are structured more like trainings.

One of the key measures under the forthcoming DE policy is to develop and implement an Evaluation Capacity Development Programme, which will combine all the above initiatives.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

While identification and hiring of evaluation teams is the responsibility at the decentralized level for these evaluations, the Office of Evaluation can and does readily advise on competent and skilled consultants at each region/per thematic area. The Office of Evaluation also provides contacts of evaluation specialists from its roster.



IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

- The Office of the Evaluation insists on the DE manager to not be connected (involved in design or implementation) to the entity that is being evaluated. For this reason, we have suggested it is possible to go up to the sub-regional or regional levels for the decentralized offices to select an evaluation manager.
- Evaluation must be conducted by external consultants with no conflict of interest.
- Evaluation officers outposted to the regional offices will still report to the HQ Office of Evaluation.

Additionally:

- Ensure degree of separation between those organizing the evaluation and the manager of the program/project being evaluated, when possible
- Choosing from a wide pool of evaluation consultants (to avoid the CO being one of the usual potential employers for the consultant).
- Promote the use of evaluation management groups or evaluation committees.
- Ensure the systematic signature of ethical codes of conduct and guidelines on behavioural independence by consultants;
- Promote open and transparent dissemination of the evaluation products.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

- For DE, project or programme budget of the entity under evaluation is utilized.
- At the project formulation stage, the proposals are shared with the Office of Evaluation, and we recommend 0.8 to be dedicated to each project evaluation.
- Other costs: outposted evaluation specialists, evaluation quality support, post-hoc assessment, capacity-building activities are covered by the Office of Evaluation budget.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

As per the UNEG Norms and Standards, DE reports will be published. This should work as an incentive to maintain unbiased evaluation products. Publication will be the responsibility of the Office of Evaluation, with the reports clearly marked as DEs.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

- Requested for all DE, as per the Project Evaluation manual for decentralized offices.
- Relevant templates and guidance on management responses are provided.

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

The Office of Evaluation is working more and more on synthesis of project evaluations, by thematic or regions, and is sharing these syntheses with evaluation focal points in decentralized offices.

A new communication strategy has also been recently developed for the Office of Evaluation.



ILO

DEFINITION OF DE

DE are those for which the primary responsibility lies with regions and departments, including resourcing. For a DE to be labelled independent, the evaluation management is by certified evaluation manager (not connect to evaluand), using and external team with final oversight and approval of the evaluation by the ILO Evaluation Office (see [here](#), page 13).

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The [ILO evaluation policy](#), para 19, notes that: DEs include thematic evaluations (other than those managed by EVAL), project evaluations, impact evaluations, joint evaluations and internal reviews, which also include self-evaluations. Their resourcing is primarily the responsibility of departments and regions.

Mandatory independent decentralized project and joint evaluations are managed through the evaluation management system established and overseen by EVAL, based on a network of certified evaluation managers, departmental evaluation focal points and designated evaluation officers at the regional level.

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

The ILO Evaluation Office is structurally independent from management functions and has a dual reporting line to the Director General and Governing Body of the ILO.

Regional and departmental evaluation networks support the planning and implementation of evaluation activities for development cooperation projects. At the regional level, the network comprises designated evaluation officers at the regional offices to support the planning and implementation of evaluation activities with help from certified evaluation managers.

Reporting lines and responsibilities of the designated evaluation officers are being reviewed to ensure the highest possible level of independence and impartiality of evaluations undertaken in the regions. At the department level, the network comprises designated departmental evaluation focal points to support the planning and implementation of evaluation activities with help from certified evaluation managers. EVAL provides technical guidance and assistance to the network and maintains final oversight to ensure quality and independence

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

The ILO's evaluation function integrates planning for evaluations at all levels to build a robust evidence base to support high-level evaluations; and allow for integrated budgets and more strategic evaluations, including clustering of evaluations whenever effective and efficient, to minimize the number of evaluations and provide broader strategic findings.

- **Centralized evaluations:** EVAL will propose to the Governing Body each year a proposed rolling programme of evaluation work at the strategy and policy levels.
- **DEs:** Mandatory evaluations, whether independent or internal, are part of an integrated planning and scheduling process maintained and overseen by EVAL, based on funding agreements and approved programme and project documents. Evaluation activities that lie outside mandatory requirements are managed by departments and regions (see [here](#), para 27-29)

QA – GUIDANCE

The ILO policy guidelines provide a complete package of guidance for ILO staff, who are tasked with planning, managing, overseeing and/or following up on evaluation recommendations. EVAL introduced version in 2013 and has since had two updates. A revised version is planned for release in 2020. The most recent version of these guidelines can also be accessed on [EVAL's public website](#).



These guidelines, while available as a formal and freestanding document, also serve as the backbone of the “I-eval resource kit”. The kit consists of the guidelines and a USB key in one package. It was conceived to serve as a gateway into ILO expertise and knowledge on evaluation for both ILO managers and practitioners. The ILO evaluation guidelines are an integral part of the mandate of the Evaluation Office.

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Eval uses a layered approval process involving evaluation managers, departmental evaluation focal points, regional evaluation officers and final sign-off by senior evaluation officers in Eval HQ that provide real-time quality assurance for project evaluations.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The internal quality control is complemented by ex-post quality appraisals that are conducted by external appraisers.

The most recent aggregated results show that, overall, 98 per cent of 2017–2018 evaluation reports appraised obtained ratings equal to or above “satisfactory”.

Eval has recently evolved its ex-post quality appraisal process to conduct assessments quicker (on a rolling basis instead of batches) to ensure that systemic problems can be quickly identified and addressed.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

Eval’s full-time network consist of a small HQ team (5 professionals) and regional evaluation officers (5). This full-time team of professionals is complemented by a network of volunteers (departmental focal points (10) and certified evaluation managers (over 100). There is a need to further strengthen the incentive structure for ILO colleagues who volunteer to be members of the evaluation network, namely departmental evaluation focal points, evaluation managers and internal evaluators.

Eval developed specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely (SMART) outputs and measures of performance for inclusion in the ILO’s Performance Appraisal System to ensure the work of evaluation managers is recognized.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation-related capacity development training programmes for ILO staff, tripartite constituents and other relevant stakeholders have always been an important part of ILO Eval’s strategy. In order to address these priorities, Eval is continuing to conduct three training programmes: (i) [the Evaluation Manager Certification Programme](#), (ii) [the Internal Evaluation Certification Programme](#) and (iii) [the Training Programme for the ILO Constituents on Evaluating the Decent Work Agenda in the SDG Era](#).

The linchpin of Eval’s training programme is the EMCP introduced in 2013. The training programme allows Eval to conduct many evaluations with a small number of evaluation professionals. The number of trainees who have completed all the requirements (Online course, face-to-face training and practicum) EMCP certification continues to grow. Currently, a grand total of 165 trainees have been gone through the workshop. One hundred and eighteen (118) have completed all the requirements for certification. The overall EMCP completion rate stands at around 72 per cent.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

The ILO Evaluation Office (Eval) relies on highly qualified evaluators to conduct independent evaluations of its projects, programmes, strategies and policies. The standard approach to recruitment is through a call for candidates but direct selection can be undertaken as well if warranted and justified. Eval keeps a roster of consultants and requires a feedback form from the evaluation manager on every consultant.

Eval has developed this orientation programme to support evaluation consultants become more familiar with the unique aspects of the ILO and its evaluation policy and practice. This one-hour self-induction programme is structured in two parts. Part I provides an overview of ILO, its work and the role of the Organization in the 2030 Agenda. Part II introduces the Evaluation Office, its policy and strategy, and the types of evaluations and characteristics of DEs processes. While not



mandatory to undertake work for EVAL, Evaluation consultants interested to work with the ILO are invited to complete the self-induction programme and include the attestation of completion in future expression of interest for ILO evaluation assignments.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

High-level evaluations for the Governing Body are undertaken by the central Evaluation Office. DE for projects above USD 1 million need to be independent and therefore require an internal quality review system (hybrid system) that holds the Evaluation Office responsible for final quality and independence. It has several safeguards ranging from checklists, reviews by regional officers, reviews by senior evaluation officer in HQ and ex-post quality review. Evaluators also need to sign a statement that they shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit that is being evaluated. Evaluators are also required to disclose in writing to the Evaluation Manager any past experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. See here for more information.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The Evaluation Office has a regular budget allocation approved by the Governing Body that covers staff in HQ and operating costs for high-level evaluations and capacity development. All voluntary contributions by donors to the ILO need to include 2% for evaluation.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

I-Eval Discovery is an interactive feature that visually displays all planned and completed ILO evaluation reports and their related lessons learned, good practices and recommendations. This intuitive application provides tailored information through various filters, such as by theme, year, region, country, evaluation type, timing and nature. Information is downloadable and easy to share through export features. It can be used to inform project design, implementation, and organizational learning.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

- High-level evaluations for the Governing body need to include a management response.
- There is an evaluation advisory committee with the responsibility to follow up on the management response to high-level evaluations.
- All project evaluations need to have a management response collected in a repository. In collaboration with the department of Information and Technology Management, EVAL launched an Automated Management Response System in 2018 to follow up on management response to independent evaluation recommendations, thus improving overall efficiency, reporting and organizational learning.
- The management response repository is being linked to i-eval discovery to ensure the full suit of evaluation deliverables is available to the public. Other initiatives/systems to enhance use (evidence maps, synthesis, learning events, etc.).

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

EVAL is responsive to the need to analyze and synthesize evaluation findings that are in line with strategic knowledge requirements.

[Synthesis reviews, meta-studies and think pieces](#) have been carried out since 2011 based on requests from technical departments, while others supported recurrent discussions of the International Labour Conference or responded to EVAL's requirement of reporting on the ILO's overall effectiveness.



IOM

DEFINITION OF DE

Definition is included in the IOM Evaluation policy (see [here](#)) as follows: “decentralized evaluations are evaluations commissioned and managed outside the IOM central evaluation office (OIG/Evaluation) – by Headquarters Departments, Regional Offices and Country Offices – focusing on activities, themes, operational areas, policies, strategies, and projects falling under their respective areas of work”.

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

Broad elements are included in the [IOM Evaluation Policy](#). New IOM evaluation guidelines are under development, including elements of normative references for DEs.

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

Roles and responsibilities for DEs are included in the [IOM evaluation policy](#).

The central Evaluation office located in the Office of the Inspector General establishes institutional policies and rules for the management of DE. In cooperation with the network of eight Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officers, it works on centralizing information related to planning and completion of DE. It provides also specific technical guidance to field offices. The regional evaluation network supports the planning and implementation of evaluation activities in the respective regions.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

IOM Central Evaluation office - OIG/Evaluation is working with the IOM decentralized network of Regional M&E Officers to have yearly plans of DEs conducted in the regions. The evaluations recorded are mainly evaluations of programmes and projects implemented in the respective regions. Evaluations are mandatory for all programmes and projects implemented and if not planned, clear justifications should be given.

QA – GUIDANCE

A meta-evaluation has been completed in April 2020, which will also include recommendations for the set-up of a quality assessment system of IOM central and DEs.

Currently, the use of UNEG checklists is recommended for QA and it is usually done at the Regional level through the Regional M&E Officers.

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

It is work in progress. Currently, quality checks, in addition of using the UNEG guidance, also refer to IOM instructions on Evaluation (IOM Evaluation Guidelines and IOM Project Handbook mainly) which give guidance on how to develop ToR, Inception reports and evaluation reports. A specific IOM checklist has been developed for the inclusion of Gender in evaluations and guidance on the follow-up of implementation of recommendation has been issued.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The Meta Evaluation completed in April 2020 and covering the period 2017-2019 has established a framework and rating system of reference, which will be applied to future similar exercises for sake of harmonization and comparison.



TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

The central evaluation office coordinates the work related to institutional technical guidance and develops necessary tools and guidelines to implement it, including e-learning courses and face to face trainings. Technical support/ advise to field offices is mainly provided by IOM Regional M&E Officers, including through the organization of trainings, webinars and workshop.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

In addition to technical guidance and assistance provided (see above), IOM Central Evaluation office has developed 2 training activities that provide elements for capacity building in Evaluation: (i) a facilitator-led M&E e-learning course and (ii) a face to face internal evaluator training, for the setup of a roster of internal evaluators. Coaching is also given for the internal evaluator training.

Capacity development is part of the OIG/Evaluation strategy. More work is on-going for national capacity development for evaluating migration at the Government level (following the adoption of the SDG and of the Global Compact on Migration).

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

Detailed instructions on the identification and recruitment of evaluation teams are available in the IOM Project Handbook.. Rosters are available at the central and regional levels with indications on poor performance whenever the case.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

Impartiality provisions are promoted using UNEG Norms and Standards and other UNEG ethical guidelines. There is no specific IOM guidance.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

IOM has general rules on the amount/ percentage to set aside for evaluations of programmes and projects, but they are not mandatory. IOM suggests a provision ranging from 5 to 10 per cent of a project's budget for monitoring and evaluation, with 2 to 4% allocated to evaluation. More efforts could be done for higher financial allocations to evaluations and for fundraising.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

An internal repository and evaluation dashboards are available, and OIG/Evaluation is currently working on a repository and dashboards to be made available externally. [IOM Evaluation Webpage](#) is open to the public and is recording all IOM evaluations.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

A new IOM guidance note on Management Response has just been published. Management Response is become mandatory as well as the follow-up of implementation up to 18 months after issuance of the report.

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

OIG/Evaluation is promoting the conduct of synthesis evaluations in coordination with IOM Departments: two such evaluations are in the pipeline for 2020. More will be done in 2020 with the Regional M&E Officers to further promote the use of evaluations as well as lessons learning initiatives. Webinars for instance are used for such a purpose. A community of practice also exists to exchange information and organize learning events.

UN WOMEN

DEFINITION OF DE

DEs are conducted by independent external evaluators but commissioned and managed by programmatic offices (HQ divisions, Regional Offices, COs and Programme Presence). Definition of DE is provided on the Evaluation Policy (page 8). The Evaluation Policy is currently under revision, but a similar definition and provision is maintained for DEs.

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The Evaluation Policy governs the evaluation function and establishes a framework for ensuring an independent evaluation function. With the co-location of the Independent Evaluation Service and Internal Audit Services, the Evaluation Policy is further augmented by a corporate [Charter for the Independent Evaluation and Audit Services \(IEAS\) UN-Women](#).

The Evaluation Policy is further operationalized through a corporate Procedure for DEs (yet to be finalized), which provides a framework to further strengthen the impartiality, quality and credibility including delineating a shared responsibility for the DE function, governance/ reporting lines.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

Multi-year costed evaluation plans are prepared as part of the Monitoring, Research and Evaluation Plan (MERP) and submitted alongside the Country/ Regional Strategic Note (equivalent of country programmes for other agencies). The plan provides a list of evaluations to be commissioned and managed by UN Women Programme Units.

Selection of evaluations is guided by a combination of the eight criteria outlined in the UN Women Evaluation Policy and the updated evaluation norms paper. These are relevance of the subject; risk associated with the intervention; significant investment; demands for accountability from stakeholders; potential for replication and scaling-up; potential for joint or UNSDCF evaluation; feasibility for implementing the evaluation; and filling a knowledge gap. All eight parameters are not meant to be applied, but rather should guide and provide ample justification for selection.

DE Evaluation coverage norm:

- Country Portfolio Evaluation: at least once during two Strategic Note cycles, sequenced to inform the next Strategic Note. IES is transitioning to take ownership and control of selected CPEs as independent IES-led;
- at least one strategic evaluation in each region during the Strategic Note life cycle.

In addition, evaluations may be mandatory based on donor agreements (an individual project, a portfolio of activities funded by a donor under a framework agreement, or a multi-donor framework funded by several partners).

The coverage norms are under review and will be updated in July 2020.

QA – GUIDANCE

[The UN Women Evaluation Handbook](#) provides the standards, tools, checklist and the processes for EQA [Tool 1 and Tool 14]. This is further supplemented through [a guidance on Evaluation Quality Assessment](#) and [EQA grid](#), codified in the UN Women Global Evaluation Reports Assessment and Analysis System (GERAAS).

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

QA that corresponds to key milestones of UN Women evaluation process (planning, preparation, conduct, reporting and use and follow up) including key evaluations products (TOR, IR, draft/final reports) is performed by IES Regional Evaluation Specialists.

A more rigorous peer review mechanism is in place for evaluations considered strategic at the DE level: regional thematic/ operational and country portfolio evaluations. Both evaluations are either co-managed by IES staff with the respective

office or led entirely by IES HQ staff and Regional Evaluation Specialist, with support of external consultant/s. The Internal Peer Review mechanism is a vehicle to encourage substantive and deeper peer exchange among HQ-based and Regional Evaluation Specialists as well as colleagues from Internal Audit Service (esp. on efficiency criteria). The peer review covers the key milestones of the evaluation cycle: TOR, IR, and Draft Reports.

The Chief of Evaluation and Director of IEAS provide final layer of QA before approval.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

PHQA is outsourced to an external consultant/ firm to provide transparent and independent QA of evaluation reports. All completed evaluation reports are reviewed based on the GERAAS and EQA grid. Summary of detailed feedback and rating of the quality of evaluation reports is provided to concerned office and posted online onto the GATE system (an online repository of evaluation reports and management response).

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

IES Evaluation Specialists in regional offices assume prime responsibility in providing technical/ advisory and QA support to evaluations at the DE level.

Similar support is offered by IES HQ staff to HQ divisions commissioning evaluations. This is in addition to any QA mechanism established within the offices.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Internal and partners' capacity on evaluations is guided by two main building blocks of an evaluation professionalization programme: (i) evaluation handbook on how to manage gender-responsive evaluation and an online eLearning course (aimed at developing core competencies in managing gender-responsive evaluation for UN Women staff) and (ii) a coaching programme to ensure hands-on learning.

These are supplemented through regional face-to-face training (combined with RBM, programme management etc.), and a series of webinars covering different topics relevant to the DE by Regional Evaluation Specialists.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

As per the HR policy, recruitment of consultant/ evaluation team for DE is performed through an open and competitive process by the evaluation commissioning office. Desk review provisions for individual consultants are also available and frequently used, which are faster but also less transparent and competitive than public calls for and competitive selection.

For strategic evaluations such as Regional Thematic and Country Portfolio Evaluations, IES Regional Evaluation Specialists usually take part in the recruitment.

Procurement for the services of consultants/ firms is mainly done through one of the following options: (i) a call for proposal particularly for firms; and (ii) recruitment of individual consultant/s through job ads.

LTA and roster of consultants is currently under consideration to expand the pool of applicants and expediate the recruitment process.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

The Evaluation Policy and the IEAS Charter provide the impartiality safeguards primarily for the corporate/ independent level.

- IES undertakes corporate/independent evaluations with the support of external evaluators where specific skill sets are needed to supplement its team.
A hybrid architecture for regional thematic evaluations and CPEs is in place where IES staff takes the lead or joint co-management role with the commissioning office.
- Regional evaluation specialists are part of the IES but deployed in each regional office with direct reporting line to the Chief of IES [provides TA and QA support to all evaluation processes and products at DE]

- Evaluation managers should not be the manager of the programme being evaluated or, at a minimum, not have individual decision-making authority in evaluation processes.
- ET composed of independent consultants: no involvement in project design, formulation, implementation or monitoring.
- Evaluation Management Group and Evaluation Reference Group provides additional layer of safeguard for impartiality for all DEs.
- Independent review of final evaluation reports (PHQA) against established standards and rubrics.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

- A notional target of 3% of programme budget to evaluation [subject to change in the new Policy to a range of 2%-3%).
- Regional, multi-country and COs allocate budget for evaluations (a mix of core and non-core resources mainly per donor agreements).
- Salary of all Regional Evaluation Specialists (x6) and associated travel cost is borne by IES.
- A small portion of CPEs are fully funded by IES or supported by a matching fund (esp. for offices with limited financial envelop).

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

There is an online repository of evaluation reports and management response: [Global Accountability and Tracking of Evaluation use \(GATE\)](#)

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

- Mandatory for all evaluation reports.
- Management Response with corresponding committed actions is required to be posted on GATE within six weeks after the upload of the evaluation report.
- Status of Management Response implementation tracked by IES through its Global Evaluation Oversight System.
- Management response [guidance and template provided in the Evaluation Handbook](#).

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

- Annual meta-synthesis of both corporate and DE.
- Periodic evaluation flagship magazine Transform.
- Communication and dissemination package for CPEs.
- Regional Evaluation Strategies.
- Internal evaluation community of practice.
- Communication and KM strategy.
- Gender Equality Evaluation Portal Extranet.



UNDP

DEFINITION OF DE

Division of responsibility for implementing decentralized evaluations (country offices, regional offices and headquarters) and central evaluations (IEO) outlined in the [Evaluation Policy](#).

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The architecture and reporting lines are set out in the [Evaluation policy](#).

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

UNDP IEO operates independently of UNDP management in workplan setting and reporting. UNDP IEO is clearly separated from UNDP management and reports to the UNDP Executive Board who appoint the Director and approve the office 4-year workplan.

IEO presents annual work with the Audit and Evaluation Advisory Committee who in turn gives guidance to the Administrator.

DE sit in the Bureau structure of the organization. DE plans are developed and submitted to the EB and accompany new Country Programme Documents.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

Programme units (Bureaus and CO) develop evaluation plans which accompany their Country Programme Documents.

Implementation and oversight are given by regional M&E focal points.

Evaluation plans should be “strategic in nature and provide broad coverage of the programme”.

Evaluation plans are open documents, uploaded to the UNDP evaluation resource Centre.

QA - GUIDANCE

The evaluation policy defers to the [UNDP evaluation guidelines](#) for the quality assurance, which contain all templates and expected evaluation approaches, timescales and structures.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

CO should call on regional M&E focal points for support when required when drafting TORs and reviewing/ approving evaluation reports.

When uploaded to the ERC, the regional M&E focal point is expected to review TORs and final reports and provide feedback.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Stringent QA process undertaken annually led by IEO, using a pool of experts to review all UNDP evaluations.

QA process and details are part of the Evaluation guidelines and results and comments provided through the ERC.

<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>



TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

COs are supported by the regional M&E focal points, but the level of support varies by region. IEO has received funding to expand its support to DE in the future.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

IEO has led training of CO M&E focal points in most regions in 2017 and 2019, based on the new evaluation guidelines launched in 2019. In 2020, 2 sets of online training will be launched. One set will be required and certified and is targeted at M&E focal points (and others). Second set is shorter and is non-mandatory for all UNDP staff.

IEO also led a series of Webinars in 2019 and will continue in 2020. Regional Bureaus also run their own webinars on evaluation planning as well as ad-hoc training.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

The Evaluation Resource Center has a database of evaluators as well as the ability to see examples of work and QA scores for evaluation reports. Several Regional Bureaus have evaluator rosters. A central certified roster of evaluators is being developed by UNDP to support evaluation.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

- Impartiality guidance given to programme units in the [guidelines](#).
- All evaluators required to sign an ethics form.
- Regional M&E focal point act for dispute resolution.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Evaluation policy assigns 1 % for evaluation with 0.3 percent for IEO and 0.7 percent for programme units. Actual expenditure on evaluation has been around 0.5% for the organization but is increasingly slightly

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

All UNDP evaluations since 2006 can be found on the [evaluation resource Centre](#). This is open. However, quality assessment scores and other oversight tools are only available on sign in for focal points

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

All recommendations must have a management response. At present between 90-95% do have this. Management responses must be developed and uploaded to the ERC within 6 weeks of acceptance of an evaluation report.

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

The ERC is regularly being refined and updated as a key oversight platform with dashboards on evaluation implementation for management, M&E focal points, regional M&E focal points and IEO.

Quality Assessment tool will be further refined in 2020.



UNESCO

DEFINITION OF DE

Opposite to corporate level evaluations which are managed/ conducted or commissioned by the UNESCO IOS Evaluation Office, DEs include all project level evaluations and all evaluations that are managed/ coordinated by UNESCO Programme Sectors, Central Services, Field Offices and/or Category 1 Institutes.

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

Included in the [UNESCO Evaluation Policy \(2015\)](#) and information note on budgeting for DEs (available on the intranet portal).

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

The UNESCO Evaluation Office is located within the Internal Oversight Service together with Internal Audit and Investigation Units at UNESCO HQ in Paris. DEs are commissioned and managed by the programme staff, both in field office locations and HQ. The DEs and resulting products are not subject to the same level of approval and clearance by the IOS Evaluation Office. However, most DEs are subject to reporting to the respective donors.

Dedicated technical support is made available through the Evaluation Focal Point Network, with two focal points per office / programme sector / category 1 institute who backstop evaluations in their networks. Evaluation specialists at the HQ Evaluation Office provide technical support on request and a dedicated evaluation officer at HQ provides ongoing technical support, and supports the development of evaluation plans, a repository for evaluation reports, among other, to support DEs jointly with the focal points.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

All UNESCO programmes and extrabudgetary projects are subject to evaluation, either self-evaluation, self-evaluation with external validation or external evaluation. All extrabudgetary projects above US \$ 1.5 million are subject to external evaluation. DEs are defined in the 2014-21 UNESCO Evaluation Policy.

Evaluation plans are, in principle, to be developed by each field office, programme Sector / category 1 Institute and to be submitted to the evaluation focal points who upload them into the Evaluation Focal Point Network, a shared space to which all evaluation focal points and staff can access.

As per the [UNESCO Evaluation Policy \(2015\)](#), the nature of the evaluation depends on the size and complexity of the project. The provisions for decentralized evaluation are explicitly referred to in the donor agreement and, as per the standard project document template, should also be described in the project document and budget. The evaluation may relate to an individual project, a portfolio of activities funded by a donor under a framework agreement, or a multi-donor framework funded by several partners.

DEs are complementary to corporate evaluations and considered for ensuring coverage across all Expected Results defined in UNESCO's Programme and Budget documents.

QA – GUIDANCE

The Evaluation Office provides some level of backstopping to DE. It established an evaluation focal point network in 2017 with dedicated evaluation focal points to support the management and conduct of DEs. Ongoing QA and technical support, and more checklists and guidance are provided to the focal points who in turn enhance their evaluation technical skills and improve quality assurance and support for evaluations undertaken in their respective Programme Sectors/Field Offices/Category 1 Institutes.

In its yearly synthetic review of evaluations, the IOS Evaluation Office assesses the quality of both corporate and major DEs conducted in a given year.



QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Project staff commission and manage evaluations (either self or external independent), and the reports are submitted to the focal points to provide some level of QA. Focal points, in case of complex evaluations, request support for technical review from the IOS Evaluation Office. However, the QA process is not systematically applied for all DEs.

In its yearly synthetic review of evaluations, the Evaluation Office assesses the quality of both, corporate and major DEs conducted in a given year. Criteria are in line with the UNEG quality checklist for evaluation reports and highlight adherence to specific criteria including gender equality and relevance for specific SDGs.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The post-hoc QA is conducted during the synthesis review process by a consultant external to the IOS Evaluation Office for external evaluations of major donor-funded extrabudgetary projects/ programmes. However smaller scale DEs do not go through this same process.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

The IOS Evaluation Office provides dedicated support for strengthening of DE capacity to manage, conduct and quality assure evaluations, among other through webinars and provision of guidance material for focal points and other interested programme officers. Upon request, a dedicated officer and other five individual evaluation officers from the HQ Evaluation Office (organized per region) provide technical support and guidance on specific evaluations. For major DE, the IOS Evaluation Office is represented in the reference group.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

All evaluation focal points have participated in three-day training workshops, and ongoing punctual webinars shall further enhance evaluation capacity and strengthen quality of DEs. Following the three-day training workshops for evaluation focal points in the different regions during 2017, a four module online training on evaluation management has been piloted and rolled out to all UNESCO staff in 2019. Completion of the online training is mandatory for focal points.

Following a needs assessment for technical areas of interest and use for Evaluation Focal Points, several webinars and resources have been offered, including topics such as TOC and self-evaluation. Upcoming topics for webinars are on gender equality/ human rights.

Plans include to provide ongoing support for one focal point per region to accompany and promote a learning by doing transmission of technical and soft evaluation management skills.

Technical support from the Evaluation Office for programme staff in commissioning / managing and quality assuring a specific evaluation is provided as a learning opportunity for programme staff and focal points; fully managing a DE is one of the criteria to obtain/ maintain the status of focal point.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

It is the responsibility of programme staff charged with an evaluation management. Support in the procurement process is provided by the Evaluation Office and the Evaluation Focal Points who also provide support for the identification of consultants.

The development of a roster of evaluation consultants per region is envisaged for smaller scale evaluations. All bigger scale evaluations assignments are published widely through RFPs or restricted calls for proposals.



IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

Impartiality guidance is provided and integrated in TORs and RFPs of all corporate and major DEs, with requirements to respect UNEG Norms and Standards; UNEG Ethical guidelines, and UNEG guidance for gender equality in evaluation. Furthermore, requirements include applying gender equality and culturally sensitive evaluation approaches and no prior involvement in design and/or implementation in any of the activities under evaluation. However, not all TORs of smaller scale DEs follow the same standards.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The UNESCO Evaluation Policy requires that Programme staff put aside and dedicate 3% of both, regular programme funds for corporate evaluations and respective extrabudgetary project budgets for DEs.

A specific guidance note has been issued for operationalizing this target and it has since been more consistently applied. The target is improving and getting closer to being met for projects designed/ budgets approved post -2015.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

All corporate evaluation reports are available on the UNESCO IOS website, DE reports are hosted and are available internally through an online platform with currently limited usage by focal points and staff; a public database for DE reports has not yet been established.

However, some DE reports are made publicly available on a case to case basis and in agreement with the respective donor(s).

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Different to corporate evaluations for which management responses are mandatory and published together with the report, only in few cases of high level/ strategic level DE management responses have been developed and respective action plans have been developed and are followed up.

Other project level DE are mostly end of project evaluations that do not systemically develop management responses and follow up. There are however opportunities for developing lessons learned that can feed into future project design.

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

Webinar trainings ongoing (self-evaluation, ToC); updating Evaluation handbook, development of checklists and templates; BBL learning events.

A joint synthesis exercise was conducted in 2019 as a pilot to assess progress towards SDG 4, target 5:

- [Meta synthesis: Making evaluation work for the achievement of SDG 4 target 5: equality and inclusion in Education.](#)

A follow up is planned and similar exercises to be conducted for other SDG targets.



UNFPA

DEFINITION OF DE

DE are evaluations - at country, regional and HQ level - that are managed by the business unit responsible for the programme being evaluated (rather than by the Evaluation Office, which conducts centralized evaluations), and are conducted by independent, external evaluators. DE are defined in the 2019 [UNFPA Evaluation Policy](#).

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The overarching normative framework of the decentralized function draws on and builds upon UNEG and OECD DAC guidance and is set in the [2019 evaluation policy](#), which details “evaluation principles and procedures; sets out roles and responsibilities; describes contributions to system-wide evaluations and national evaluation capacity development; highlights human and financial resource requirements; and concludes with a note on the implementation, reporting and future review of the policy.”

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

The Evaluation Policy provides clear roles and responsibilities with respect to evaluation at all levels of UN-Women (both corporate/ independent and DEs). Functional and organizational independence of the Independent Evaluation Service is preserved through:

- Direct reporting line of the Director of the Independent Evaluation and Audit Services to the Executive Director;
- Annual report on Evaluation Function and periodic presentation of corporate evaluations and synthesis of DEs to the Executive Board;
- Oversight Advisory Committee (who has consultative purview over appointment and dismissal of the Director);
- Direct reporting line (both functional and administrative) of the Regional Evaluation Specialists (x6) to the Chief of Independent Evaluation Service (IES).

Reporting and staffing structure at DE level differs across offices. Chiefly, M&E officers/ focal points serve as evaluation managers and report to their line manager within the same office (no direct or matrixed reporting line to the Evaluation Office or Regional Advisers in Regional Offices).

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

The [quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan](#) (QBEP) offers a coherent framework to guide the commissioning, management and use of both centralized and DEs and provides the basis for monitoring and reporting on the implementation decentralized programme level evaluations.

The approach to evaluation planning, coverage, and selection is detailed in the QBEP.

The QBEP also includes a list of proposed centralized (managed by the Evaluation Office) and decentralized programme-level evaluations (country and regional programme evaluations) over the 4-year period, along with attendant budget information.

Country and regional costed evaluation plans are also developed during the development of country and regional programme documents. The plans are compulsory and detail all planned evaluations over the course of the country or regional programme. They are annexed to the submission of the country and regional programme for the approval of the Executive Board.



QA - GUIDANCE

The evaluation office has developed various tools and guidance to support/enhance the quality of evaluations at UNFPA, including templates for quality assurance (templates for the [terms of reference](#) and the [design report](#) of UNFPA country programme evaluations). In 2019, an updated version of the [Evaluation Handbook: How to Design and Conduct a Country Programme Evaluation at UNFPA](#) was launched, providing additional methodological guidance on integrating gender and human rights in evaluation and evaluating in humanitarian contexts.

Currently the Evaluation Office is developing an e-learning (for internal UNFPA staff) on managing country programme evaluations at UNFPA based on the information presented in the Evaluation Handbook.

While [quality assessment](#) takes place after an evaluation is completed (ex post) (where the final evaluation report is quality assessed by an external independent assessor against 7 quality criteria captured in the UNFPA EQA Grid), the criteria for assessment can also be used for quality assurance (i.e. the EQA Grid can be a quality assurance tool) throughout the evaluation process, to help ensure that the evaluation is meeting quality standards.

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Quality assurance is the responsibility of the respective evaluation manager, supported, at the decentralized level, by regional M&E advisors (each of the 6 UNFPA regional offices has one regional M&E advisors meant to technically support COs in the region).

Quality assurance of country programme evaluations is further supported by the Evaluation Office. In order to strengthen the quality of country programme evaluations (the most common type of DE), the Evaluation Office approves the TORs and pre-qualifies the evaluation team members. It is, expected, however, that this assurance role will be fully decentralized to the regional M&E advisors in the coming years.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Quality assessment takes place after an evaluation is completed (ex post), whereby the final evaluation report is quality assessed by an external assessor for reporting and only two types of evaluations are quality assessed at UNFPA: 1) centralized evaluations, managed by the Evaluation Office, and 2) decentralized programme level evaluations (i.e. country programme evaluations and regional programme evaluations).

The evaluation reports are assessed against 7 quality criteria detailed in the [EOA Grid](#). Note that the 7th criteria (on the integration of gender equality in evaluation) reflects the exact indicators of the evaluation policy indicator of the UN SWAP on Gender Equality.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

Formally, regional M&E advisors, based in the 6 UNFPA regional offices, provide technical support to COs on M&E, though the level of support varies. At times, however, COs reach out directly to the Evaluation Office for support/ guidance, particularly in the development of the TORs for country programme evaluations.

Roles and responsibilities are detailed in the [2019 Evaluation Policy](#).

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

The Evaluation Office has led regional trainings on how to manage CPEs, based on the guidance provided in the Handbook (please see above). The Evaluation Office is currently developing an e-learning (for internal UNFPA staff) on managing country programme evaluations at UNFPA based on the information presented in the Evaluation Handbook, intended to support capacity to manage CPEs. Regional advisors also support the capacity of CO M&E staff through trainings, workshops, etc. Finally, UNFPA works to support national evaluation capacity development, through, inter alia, support to national networks and forums.



IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

DE teams are comprised of individual consultants (mostly from the respective regions; national consultants are often used as thematic experts) that are recruited through a competitive process. A roster of vetted evaluation and thematic experts is also available and is an additional source for potential candidates.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

Impartiality is defined in the UNFPA Evaluation Policy, and each evaluator is required to sign an Ethical Code of Conduct for UNFPA Evaluations, which, inter alia, states that “Evaluations of UNFPA-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous”.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The 2019 Evaluation Policy states that the “the evaluation function should be predictably and adequately resourced. [Toward this end] UNFPA will allocate a minimum of 1.4% of its total programme expenditure to the evaluation function, up to a maximum of 3%. In country and regional offices, resource allocation decisions for evaluations are based on the country and regional costed evaluation plan.” UNFPA allocates funds for the Evaluation Office (and centralized evaluations) using a separate budget line in the UNFPA integrated budget.

In 2019, the UNFPA Executive Director established a mechanism to ring-fence funds to support conducting and managing evaluations in COs facing financial constraints (key reasons planned DE are cancelled in the past).

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

UNFPA maintains a publicly available [repository/ database](#) of evaluation reports, and their accompanying quality assessment and management response.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

As detailed in the 2019 Evaluation Policy: “UNFPA is committed to developing and implementing management responses for all evaluations. In this regard, management is responsible for preparing management responses to all centralized and decentralized evaluations, developed within six weeks of the submission of the evaluation reports for equality assessment”.

The implementation status of all evaluation recommendations (centralized and decentralized) is monitored by the Policy and Strategy Division through the corporate management response tracking system. This information is available to senior management and the Executive Board: (i) through the strategic plan indicators in the annual report of the Executive Director; and (ii) periodically in progress updates on the management actions undertaken to address evaluation recommendations, and on any implications of these recommendations on systemic issues, strategic planning, policy development, programming process and key management areas. Management responses are published publicly on the [evaluation database](#).

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

The 2019 Evaluation Policy as well as the Evaluation Strategy 2018-2021 call for a stronger emphasis in ensuring that evaluations are used to inform UNFPA programmes. With the aim of monitoring the performance against this priority, starting in 2019, the Evaluation Office started to report on a key performance indicator: use of evaluation in programme development. While evaluation informed all new country programme documents approved by the Executive Board in 2018, the level and quality of use – the degree to which country programme design was clearly informed by recommendations from the previous country programme evaluation, as reported by the Programme Review Committee’s secretariat – varied, with only 78.9% of country programme documents meeting this requirement. Regional variations were registered for this key performance indicator. The Evaluation Office, together with the Policy and Strategy Division, will work to support the use of credible evaluative evidence as a key requirement for the submission of country programme documents.



UNICEF

DEFINITION OF DE

There is not a definition as such, however when the Evaluation Policy refers to the “decentralized level”, it is understood that it is the Country Office (CO) and Regional Office (RO) level. So, the DEs are those commissioned and managed by COs and ROs (see [here](#), p. 11, Table 2).

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

- The [Evaluation Policy](#).
- The [procedures](#) on the implementation of the evaluation policy. Governance/ Reporting lines

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

- The [Evaluation Office](#) works with other divisions at UNICEF headquarters and with regional offices, country offices and partners worldwide to conduct dozens of evaluations each year.
- The [UNICEF Executive Board](#) endorses the evaluation policy and provides oversight of policy implementation. The Board also endorses the [plan for global evaluations](#) and draws on evaluation findings and recommendations for the purposes of governing UNICEF. The Board approves the budget of the Evaluation Office.
- The [Executive Director](#) safeguards the integrity of the evaluation function, creates demand for evaluation evidence, ensures that evaluation recommendations are acted upon, and supports the provision of human and financial resources. The Executive Director is also responsible for fostering a culture of learning and accountability at all levels of the organization. In consultation with the Executive Board and the Audit Advisory Committee, the Executive Director appoints the director of evaluation.
- The [Director of Evaluation](#) is accountable for the oversight of the evaluation function and leads the implementation of the evaluation policy, including by conducting independent global evaluations and developing methodologies for evaluations.
- The [Audit Advisory Committee](#) advises the Executive Director on matters pertaining to the oversight of the evaluation function and the implementation of the evaluation policy. The committee, which includes an external expert on evaluation, helps to uphold norms and standards set out in the evaluation policy.
- The [Evaluation Advisory Panel](#) is an independent, external body that advises the director of evaluation on the implementation of the evaluation policy and recommends improvements to evaluation methodologies.
- The [Global Evaluation Committee](#) is internal to UNICEF. It creates opportunities for the use of evaluation evidence and follows up on the implementation of [management responses](#).
- UNICEF [headquarters' division directors](#) establish baselines and test pilots, foster continuous improvement in the delivery of programmes, ensure access to data and information, provide management responses to evaluations, promote the use of evaluation results for decision-making, and support evaluation capacity development.
- In [regional offices](#), [directors](#) ensure the upholding of evaluation policy norms and standards, the timely conduct of evaluations and preparation of management responses, and access to data and information. Regional evaluation advisers provide oversight and technical support to UNICEF country offices as they execute their evaluation responsibilities.
- In [country offices](#), [representatives](#) ensure that adequate resources are dedicated to the evaluation function, credible evaluations are conducted and used, and evaluation findings inform decision-making. They also ensure good communication with Government officials and other partners in support of the evaluation process. Multi-country-level and country evaluation specialists manage evaluations.

For more information, see [here](#) and [here](#) [p. 15-19] The **evaluation managers in COs and ROs** report to their hierarchy inside the same office (no direct reporting line to the Evaluation Office at the Head Quarters (HQ)). To maintain some distance from the head of programme, the regional evaluation advisers report to the regional director, and in the COs the

evaluation specialist are on the reporting line to the country representative; however, often at country level the evaluation function is performed by the (planning) monitoring and evaluation specialists and officers, and they normally are under the deputy representative reporting line.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

Evaluation plans should contain an appropriate mix of evaluation types. Evaluation plans are prepared at various levels of the organization, specifically:

- The plan for global evaluations is prepared by the Evaluation Office;
- Regional Evaluation Plans - for evaluating multi-country initiatives;
- Costed Evaluation Plans (CEPs), developed by COs with Government.

DE Evaluation coverage norms include (see [here](#), p. 8, 11-12):

- Country Programme Evaluation (CPE): At least once every two programme cycles.
- CO-level thematic evaluations, including crosscutting themes: At least one country thematic evaluation, country programme component evaluation or project evaluation per year for each country programme. For small country programmes, evaluation frequency may be reduced to three per programme cycle.
- Evaluation of humanitarian action:
 - Evaluation of level 1 (L1) emergencies must be included in country programme evaluations. Protracted L1 emergencies should be evaluated at least every three to five years (CO).
 - Short-term level 2 (L2) emergencies must be evaluated at least once. Protracted L2 emergencies should be evaluated once every three years (RO).

QA – GUIDANCE

QA guidance is available in the [Evaluation Policy](#). [pp. 10-12]. Quality assurance should be undertaken for TORs, inception reports and evaluation reports and carried out by an external expert or staff member with no role in managing the evaluation. Regional offices provide quality assurance for evaluations managed by the COs, and the Evaluation Office provides such services for those managed by the regional offices.

The evaluation manager ensures that the appropriate entities carry out adequate quality assurance without incurring delays. Those entities providing quality assurance (i.e., regional offices and the Evaluation Office) are responsible for ensuring that recommendations for quality improvement are acted upon. The head of the office managing the evaluation signs off upon completion and presents it to the Evaluation Office for final quality assessment.

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Quality assurance is undertaken for TORs, inception reports and evaluation reports and carried out by an external expert or staff member with no role in managing the evaluation. Regional offices provide quality assurance for evaluations managed by the COs, and the Evaluation Office provides such services for those managed by the regional offices. The quality of all evaluation reports is assessed by a specialist external to UNICEF (see [here](#), p. 10-12). Internal QA (ToR, inception report, draft report) tools are available [here](#) and [here](#)

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System ([GEROS](#)) and <https://www.unicef.org/media/54781/file>

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

COs are supported by the Regional Evaluation team, and eventually by the HQ Evaluation Office. ROs can be eventually supported by the HQ Evaluation Office. A significant responsibility of the regional evaluation adviser is to provide technical assistance and quality assurance for country-level evaluations.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

All staff with evaluation responsibilities undergo capacity development arranged by the Evaluation Office to improve their professional skills, including on gender-based analysis, human rights approaches and results-based management.

Additional opportunities for professional development are identified with a view to ensuring that evaluation staff demonstrate core competencies as outlined in the UNEG Evaluation Competency Framework. Training opportunities and technical support in evaluation are provided for programme managers. Resources are allocated to capacity development through a [pooled fund](#) (p. 22-23). Several trainings are available [online](#); and staff have also the possibility to participate to external trainings.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

It is done by the office that manages the evaluation. The teams can be identified in different ways (and the process can be managed by supply or Human Resources): (i) through a call for proposal – and identified companies/ consultants can be invited to bid/apply; (ii) through a Long-Term Agreement (LTA).

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

The evaluation of corporate programmes and initiatives is undertaken by the Evaluation Office. HQ divisions invest in activities that lay the foundations for evaluations, including the establishment of baselines, the testing of new initiatives or pilots for scaling up and the undertaking of programme reviews for the purpose of continuous improvement in delivery.

Country programme evaluations are managed by the regional evaluation adviser, with support from the Evaluation Office. Evaluation managers at all levels of the organization manage evaluations in line with the norms and standards set out in the evaluation policy. Evaluations are undertaken by independent consultants/firms and dedicated evaluation staff from the Evaluation Office, or regional evaluation advisers.

See [here](#), p. 7, Table 1: Provisions in UNICEF for upholding the norms of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

High-quality evaluations and the evaluation function more broadly require the necessary investment of financial resources. Globally, to meet minimum evaluation coverage in accordance with the evaluation policy, UNICEF will allocate at least 1 per cent of its overall programme expenditure to evaluation. In CO, resource allocation decisions for evaluations are based on the CEP. Budget allocations for evaluation should reflect the aims set out in the CEP. Regional offices should follow similar steps in mobilizing support for regional plans.

The Executive Director will establish a pooled fund to support evaluation capacity development, including for conducting and managing evaluations, especially at the decentralized level; professionalization throughout the organization; innovation in evaluation; and strategic evaluations. By emphasizing capacity development, the pooled fund will promote an enabling environment for offices to invest more in evaluation towards the organizational goal of at least 1 per cent of programme expenditure. See [here](#), p. 23.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

- Evaluation reports are available [here](#).
- There is also an internal system (EISI).



MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

- Mandatory for all evaluations.
- To be uploaded in EISI maximum 60 days after the upload of the evaluation report.
- To be closed within a year. The responsibility for updating the progress is with the evaluation 'client'; the evaluation manager follows up on the system.

See [here](#) and the [Evaluation Management Response \(EMR\) Guidance](#).

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

- New [Evaluation Website](#)
- [UNICEF Procedures for Ethical Standards](#)
- [Innovation](#)
- Resources (including [webinars and e-learning](#))

UNRWA

DEFINITION OF DE

The [2016 Evaluation Policy](#) references decentralized evaluations managed by fields or Departments but does not define it. The 2016 QA guidelines (not available online) indicate that central evaluations are commissioned by the DIOS Evaluation Division, whereas DE are generally requested by donors.

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The [2016 Evaluation Policy](#), which needs revision to fully align to UNEG and OECD DAC guidance, sets out the normative framework. The 2020 workplan for the UNRWA Evaluation Division includes revisions to the 2016 Policy and guidelines for QA for DE.

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

The Evaluation Division is located within the Department of Internal Oversight Services (DIOS) and the Chief reports to the Director of DIOS. DIOS reports to the Agency's Commissioner General and is advised by Advisory Committee on Internal Oversight (ACIO). [Organization Directive No. 14 Charter of the Department of Internal Oversight Services](#).

In 2020, it is anticipated that revisions could be made strengthening ties between DIOS, the ACIO, and the [UNRWA Advisory Commission](#).

The 2016 Policy gives the Evaluation Division responsibility for DE oversight, but the organizational structure and policy environment requires support through stronger SOPs.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

Concerning DE, fields generally develop evaluation plans based on donor / project requirements. UNRWA programme activities are guided by a five-year Medium-Term Strategy which is accompanied by a five-year evaluation plan that aims to provide strategic and balanced coverage across the Agency's strategic objectives / programme areas. The approach to planning is outlined in the QA guidelines which will be revised in 2020 with an aim to produce a procedures/ operations manual document, with process requirements.

QA - GUIDANCE

Per the 2016 Evaluation Policy, the Evaluation Division is responsible for maintaining and issuing tools and guidelines for QA. The Division (3 staff) quality assures the ToR, inception report and draft report of DEs, and can participate on Reference/ Steering groups and the procurement committee. The ED also edits, publishes and formats final reports.

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

The Evaluation Manager is responsible for following QA guidelines and tools, supported by the Evaluation Division. The Evaluation Division reviews the ToR, inception report and draft report.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Currently, post-hoc QA is limited to analysis of report adherence to UNEG standards for gender and human rights, and performance relative to UN-SWAP indicators for evaluation. Independent assessments are performed by OIOS on a biennial basis and through MOPAN.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

The Evaluation Division provides technical support and advice to field offices in Gaza, Lebanon, West Bank, Jordan and Syria, as well as to programme departments when engaged/ notified of DE activities.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Capacity development activities have not been adequately funded. A 2020 workplan for the Evaluation Division is to implement on quarterly conference calls with staff that manage DEs, and to hold one two-day workshop involving fields. UNRWA plans to review eLearning and training materials of other UN organizations and explore opportunities for use.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

DE teams are recruited through competitive processes led by the Evaluation Manager and field-level procurement teams. The adequacy of the approach needs to be reviewed by UNRWA.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

The 2016 Evaluation Policy does not currently define or elaborate on impartiality. It is promoted in the QA guidelines but will be strengthened through policy and guideline revisions in 2020.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Evaluation policy assigns 3% for evaluation from project funds for projects over 1 million however this has not been followed by the Agency. Actual expenditure on DE has been on average 0.53%.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

UNRWA maintains a public database on its [website](#).

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Mandatory for all DEs and contained as an annex to the evaluation report. The Evaluation Division provides a template and responses must include an action plan, owner and target date for implementation.

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

- Other initiatives/systems to enhance use (evidence maps, synthesis, learning events, etc.).
- The Evaluation Division Strategy for 2020-2022 includes specific objectives to strengthen collaboration, capacity and quality of DEs.
- The more immediate need is to ensure quality DEs to improve their utility and value to learning.

DEFINITION OF DE

Evaluation commissioned by COs, RBs and HQ Divisions other than the Office of Evaluation. They must be conducted by external independent teams.

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

- The [Evaluation Policy \(2016-2021\)](#) sets the vision, strategic direction and model for WFP's evaluation function.
- The [Corporate Evaluation Strategy \(2016-2021\)](#) sets out a phased implementation plan, comprising all the elements and activities required for operationalizing the Evaluation Policy including strengthening a demand-led DE function that meets UN evaluation norms and standards, and achieves the Policy's vision. Regional evaluation strategies frame the work and further define priorities at regional level.
- The [Evaluation Charter](#) confirms the mandate and governance of the evaluation function, and defines the evaluation-related roles and responsibilities across WFP. It also lays out the institutional arrangements to operationalize the policy.

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

- The Director of Evaluation heads an independent evaluation function within the WFP Secretariat, and is appointed by the Executive Director subject to approval of the EB.
- At CO level, OEV recommends that CO Evaluation Managers of DEs report directly to the Deputy Country Director or Country Director to maintain some distance from the Head of Programme but in practice this is not always possible. Regional Evaluation Officers report to the Deputy Regional Director and have a technical reporting line to the Evaluation Office.

Roles and accountabilities across WFP:

- The Executive Board exercises oversight of the evaluation function including review of progress on implementation of the Evaluation Policy; reviews OEV's work plan and approves OEV's budget as part of WFP's Management Plan, considers centralized evaluation reports and the annual evaluation report. These documents are directly presented to the EB without clearance from WFP Management.
- The Executive Director safeguards the provisions of the Evaluation Policy; encourages evaluative thinking and evidence-based decision making allocates human and financial resources across WFP to ensure evaluation capacity and coverage in line with the evaluation policy provisions; ensures that follow-up actions to evaluation recommendations are implemented.
- The Director of Evaluation provides global leadership, standard-setting and oversight of WFP's entire evaluation function. Oversees and reports on the decentralized evaluation function to the EB through the annual evaluation report.
- Regional Directors ensure application of provisions for the decentralized evaluation function and have also an important role in terms of ensuring that programmes are evidence-based.
- Directors of Headquarter Divisions, Regional and Country Directors can commission decentralized evaluations. They are also key stakeholders in centralized evaluations.
- Institutional arrangements: An Evaluation Function Steering Group was set up to ensure appropriate implementation of WFP's evaluation function, strengthening the culture of evaluation across WFP, safeguarding the Evaluation Policy provisions and facilitating the evaluation function's development.

Regional Evaluation Committees (RECs) were established in 2017, mirroring the EFSG at regional level. The EFSG and RECs meet face-to-face or virtually 2-3 times per year.

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

Evaluation planning takes place when a Country Strategic Plan (CSP) or Interim Country Strategic Plan (ICSP) is formulated. Those initial decisions contribute to early resourcing and planning. The CO develops an Assessment, Monitoring, Review and Evaluation Plan, which identifies requirements for needs assessment, monitoring, review and evaluation. This is accompanied by a detailed budget.

The number, type, timing and scope of DEs are defined by COs based on their learning needs and donors' and/or partners' interests.

The Evaluation Policy defines minimum evaluation coverage norms for DEs, which were updated in 2018 and are further detailed in a specific Technical Note: COs must plan and conduct at least one DE within the cycle of their Country Strategic Plan (ranges between 3-5 years). Large COs are encouraged to commission more than one DE.

In addition, most COs are expected to plan and budget for a Country Strategic Plan Evaluation (centrally managed by the Office of Evaluation).

Regional Evaluation Officers consolidate CO evaluation plans into a Regional Evaluation Plan which is periodically updated to reflect changes in DE plans. The Office of Evaluation manages a web-based information system in which both centralized and decentralized evaluation plans are reflected.

QA – GUIDANCE

WFP has a comprehensive [DEQAS guidance Package](#) based on the UNEG Norms and Standards that is periodically updated to reflect new learning from evaluative practice. It is comprised of a detailed Process Guide for EMs, a miniguide for Country Directors, Technical Notes, templates and quality checklists. The process guide, templates and checklists are available in Spanish and French while the technical notes are in the process of being translated.

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

While the quality assurance is the prime responsibility of the Evaluation Manager, s/he is supported by the REO as well as by the DE Quality Support service (mandatory for all DE TORs, inception reports and evaluation reports). The service is managed and funded by the Office of Evaluation but has been outsourced to an external evaluation firm. It provides a real time and impartial assessment of the quality of draft deliverables against a detailed set of criteria, along with constructive comments and recommendations, advising on how to improve the quality of draft deliverables. A 2nd iteration of the draft deliverables is then reviewed by an Evaluation Reference Group before the final evaluation report is reviewed by the evaluation manager and REO and approved by an Evaluation Committee Chaired by the Country Director.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Since 2016, OEV ensures that the quality of all final evaluation reports (including DEs) is independently assessed by external reviewers. This is the Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA). It is designed to assess the extent to which WFP evaluation reports are based upon appropriate evaluation methods, present a sound analysis and credible findings, provide valid conclusions and useful recommendations. This assessment is also used to report to the UN- SWAP on gender equality. ER quality is assessed against nine criteria, which are fully aligned with UNEG quality standards. Each PHQA report is shared with the EM and a summary report is published along the evaluation report on the WFP website. Aggregated results are presented to the EB as part of the Annual Evaluation Report.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

- Six Regional Evaluation Officers are the first port of call for COs; they are supported by 1 or 2 consultants or national officers at regional level.
- Within the Office of Evaluation, a dedicated unit (Capacity & Quality Unit) is responsible for overseeing the DE Function and managing a range of support mechanisms for the DE function. The head of this unit is also the functional supervisor of the Regional Evaluation Officers. The Capacity & Quality Unit manages a DE Helpdesk which supports HQ divisions commissioning DEs and advises the REOs. Close coordination is maintained with other units within OEV to ensure complementary and synergies with centralized evaluations.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation Capacity development constitutes one of the 4 Evaluation Policy outcomes. In 2020, OEV developed an Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) Strategy, pulling together a range of ongoing activities to ensure a comprehensive, coherent and targeted approach to internal evaluation capacity development in WFP. The strategy intends to: (i) address in a coherent manner the diverse short- and long-term evaluation learning needs of various stakeholder groups across the organization; (ii) build an Evaluation Cadre in WFP which delivers quality evaluation evidence; and (iii) ensure coherence and complementarities between OEV and regional evaluation units' ECD activities and identify relevant and complementary external ECD opportunities. Leveraging the enabling environment for evaluation in WFP, the strategy focuses on developing individual capacities to better understand, support, steer and manage evaluations at corporate, regional and country level, as well as strengthening and expanding institutional mechanisms and systems to ensure WFP has staff with the rights skills, in the right place, at the right time to deliver the Evaluation Strategy workstreams.

The Evaluation Learning Programme (EvalPro) is a comprehensive learning programme developed to strengthen the evaluation capacity of WFP staff. EvalPro targets all staff with the skills and knowledge they require to engage with or manage evaluations. The programme is made up of four online courses. EvalPro 1 targets all WFP staff and are accessible at any point in time through WFP's Evaluation Learning Channel. EvalPro 4 targets staff who are managing a DE and is designed so that learning is applied throughout the evaluation process. It combines facilitated online module and a face to face workshop (replaced by a series of webinars in 2020 to the Covid-19 pandemic). EvalPro 2 video learning series is meant for Country Directors and includes interviews with WFP Executive Staff and Senior Management who have steered a decentralized evaluation. The series is available at:

- [Umbrella Video](#)
- [The Importance of Evaluation](#)
- [Getting the Right Evidence for the Evaluation](#)
- [Safeguarding the Evaluation Principles](#)
- [Evaluation Reference Group](#)
- [Using Evaluation to Strengthen Partnerships](#)
- [From Recommendations to the Management Response](#)

Webinars are also organized with the aim of helping WFP Programme Leaders understand their role in a DE and to share tips on how to engage to make their evaluation more strategic and useful. Recording is available [here](#). Efforts to embed evaluation in other corporate training programmes are underway.

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

WFP Country Offices primarily contract evaluation teams through evaluation firms with which WFP has established a long-term agreement. There are other options for recruiting evaluation teams including contracting other firms or research institutions through a competitive procurement process or recruiting individual consultants. A WFP Roster of Evaluation Experts was established in 2016 but requires updating.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

- The Evaluation Policy defines impartiality provisions for CE and DE in alignment with UNEG norms (e.g. DEQAS for transparent evaluation management; roles and accountabilities for evaluation integrated into (i) WFP's staff performance management system; and (ii) the internal control assurance statements of directors).
- The Evaluation Charter defines accountabilities of Country Directors/ Regional Directors.
- All DE must be conducted by external independent evaluators who have no conflict of interest.
- Evaluators are required to sign the evaluators' code of conduct.
- REOs support/ oversee COs brief CO on implications of impartiality and independence principles. In case of potential breaches, they are expected to intervene and alert the Office of Evaluation as required.
- The use of an Outsourced DE Quality Support service is mandatory.
- Establishment of an Evaluation Committee for every DE to oversee the evaluation process.
- Establishment of an Evaluation Reference Group composed of internal and external stakeholders, set up to further support the relevance, utility and independence of the evaluation, by acting as a key informant to the evaluation process and providing feedback on draft products.
- Application of post hoc quality assessment to all DEs.
- Evaluation Policy envisaged the creation of a hotline, but intent has evolved since then. Plan to roll-out an integrated package of measures aimed at pre-empting and facilitating prompt resolution of situations where impartiality and ethics are at risk.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The Evaluation Policy set an overall target of 0.8% of expenditures to be devoted to evaluation. COs are expected to embed evaluation costs in their Country Portfolio Budget. As WFP relies on voluntary contributions, some COs may face funding constraints. If they had adequately planned for a decentralized evaluation and face genuine funding constraints, they can apply to contingency evaluation fund (CEF) at the time the evaluation is needed. The CEF is a replenishable fund. The decision to grant CEF resources to COs is taken after a careful assessment of the application against several criteria related to the utility and feasibility of the evaluation, and the funding situation of the CO (a TN provides detailed guidance).

Since 2017, the six Regional Bureaus have a P4 REO position. Since then, additional extra budgetary resources have been allocated to the regional evaluation units allowing the recruitment of 1 or 2 additional consultant. OEV is advocating for more sustainable funding mechanisms and staffing arrangements.

Within OEV, the unit in charge of supporting the DE Function is funded through OEV's core budget; while capacity development activities are funded through extra-budgetary resources.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

As per the Evaluation Policy, all evaluation reports including DEs are published on WFP internal (here) and external websites (here). The database allows for searching evaluation reports by evaluation type, country, year and topics. An information system (MIS) has also been developed as a single point of accurate information related to all WFP evaluations (title, type, budget, EM, RA, dates of the phases, planned and completion dates, geographical coverage, milestones achieved, team members, products, PHQA, etc.). It is used for decision making and reporting.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

- Mandatory for all DEs.
- Published with the ER.
- Follow-up actions tracked by RBs in a corporate management response system. WFP's risk management unit is leading the development of a corporate governance, risk and compliance tool that will incorporate evaluation and audit management responses and allow for more qualitative analysis.
- Technical Note on Management Response to DEs available [here](#).

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

DE commissioning units prepare a communication and dissemination plan for each DE. They are also responsible for communicating the evaluation results to affected populations.

Videos:

- [The WFP mid-term decentralized evaluation of the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation 200708 in Colombia](#)
- [Innovative participatory approach](#) discussing the evaluation findings of the midterm DE of the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation with the targeted communities through the use of drawings.
- [The summary of evaluation evidence from the Dakar Regional Bureau Decentralized Evaluations \(2016-2019\)](#)

Evidence summaries/synthesis:

- REOs have been producing thematic or country evidence summaries from DEs that are published on WFP internal website. OEV intends to produce a synthesis of DEs starting in 2020.
- The Office of Evaluation in collaboration with REOs are working on developing a more granular evidence map.

Learning:

- Evaluation Community of Practice launched in April 2017.
- Global Evaluation Meetings held every year and half.
- Regional Evaluation Bulletins produced on a monthly basis.
- [Evaluation Topic Page](#) and [Office of Evaluation Page](#) available on the intranet.
- OEV is developing a communication and knowledge management strategy.

DEFINITION OF DE

DEs are managed, commissioned or conducted outside the central Evaluation Office, that is, they are initiated by headquarters clusters, regional offices or country offices and mainly comprise programmatic and thematic evaluations. In this instance, the central Evaluation Office would provide quality assurance and technical backstopping.

NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

The 2018 [Evaluation Policy](#). A DE framework is currently in draft, with a targeted finalize by end 2020.

GOVERNANCE/ REPORTING LINES

WHO's Executive Board:

- (a) determines the evaluation policy and subsequent amendments, as needed;
- (b) provides oversight of the evaluation function within the Organization;
- (c) encourages the performance of evaluations as an input to planning and decision-making;
- (d) provides input to the biennial Organization-wide evaluation workplan on the items of specific interest to Member States;
- (e) approves the biennial Organization-wide evaluation workplan, including its budget; consider and take note of the annual report of the implementation of the biennial Organization-wide evaluation workplan;
- (f) periodically revises the evaluation policy, as necessary.

WHO's Evaluation Office is the custodian of the evaluation function and reports directly to the Director-General, and annually in a report for consideration by the Executive Board, on matters relating to evaluation at WHO. The Office is responsible for the following functions related to evaluation:

- (a) leading the development of a biennial Organization-wide evaluation workplan;
- (b) informing senior management on evaluation-related issues of Organization-wide importance;
- (c) facilitating the input of evaluation findings and lessons learned for programme planning;
- (d) coordinating the implementation of the framework for evaluation across the three levels of the Organization; DEs are undertaken almost solely by WHO regional offices or other offices away from headquarters. (Country programme evaluations fall under the corporate evaluations category and are managed by the WHO Evaluation Office.) DEs are managed by colleagues in the regional offices and other offices away from headquarters who report to their respective WHO Regional Director.
- (e) maintaining a system to track management responses to evaluations;
- (f) maintaining an online inventory of evaluations performed across WHO;
- (g) maintaining a roster of experts with evaluation experience;
- (h) providing guidance material and advice for the preparation, conduct and follow-up of evaluations;
- (i) reviewing evaluation reports for compliance with the requirements of the policy;
- (j) strengthening capacities in evaluation among WHO staff (for example, making available standardized methodologies or training on evaluation);
- (k) submitting an annual report on evaluation activities to the Executive Board;
- (l) supporting the periodic review and updates to the policy as needed.

The Director-General is responsible for appointing a technically qualified head of the Evaluation Office after consultation with the Executive Board. The Director-General likewise consults the Executive Board before any termination of the incumbent of that office. The head of the Evaluation Office serves for a fixed term of four years with a possibility of reappointment only once for a further term of four years and is barred from re-entry into the Organization after the expiry of his/her term. Additionally, the Director-General, Regional Directors, senior management and programme directors across the Organization also play a critical role in promoting a culture of evaluation. These roles and responsibilities are detailed in the [WHO Evaluation Practice Handbook](#).

EVALUATION PLANNING (COVERAGE NORMS, SELECTION OF EVALUATION SUBJECT)

WHO develops a biennial, Organization-wide evaluation workplan as part of the planning and budgeting cycle, in consultation with senior management at headquarters and regions and with Heads of WHO Offices in countries, areas and territories, based on established criteria. The biennial workplan is updated annually on the basis of the annual report to the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee and the Executive Board. Workplans are submitted to the Executive Board for approval through the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee.

The following categories are considered in the development of criteria for the selection of topics for evaluation:

- Organizational requirement relevant to: global, international or regional commitments; specific agreements with stakeholders, partners or donors; requests from governing bodies;
- Organizational significance relating to: general programme of work priorities and core functions; level of investment; inherent risks; performance issues or concerns in relation to achievements of expected results;
- Organizational utility relating to: a cross-cutting issue, theme, programme or policy question; potential for staff or institutional learning (innovation); degree of comparative advantage of WHO.

QA – GUIDANCE

WHO has a comprehensive [WHO Evaluation Practice Handbook \(2013\)](#), which details good practice expected of all evaluations both corporate and decentralized. The handbook is slated for revision in 2020.

Guidance is also provided on an ad hoc basis by the WHO Evaluation Office at all stages of the evaluation process, and Evaluation Office staff often serve on reference groups, evaluation management groups, and advisory groups for DEs.

QA - QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Owing to WHO's highly decentralized structure – it is much more decentralized than other entities throughout the UN system – QA of DEs is provided by the Evaluation Office upon request. As noted above, such support is often requested, however, and Evaluation Office staff often serve on reference groups, evaluation management groups, and advisory groups for DEs.

Owing to the aforementioned structural arrangements, coupled with very limited capacity of the WHO Evaluation Office, QA has not been consistent across DEs. The DE framework described above, which is currently in draft, aims to address issues of how to ensure more consistently high quality and credibility of DEs through enhanced QA measures.

QA - POST-HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT

There is currently no post hoc QA system in place. However, the draft DE framework described above envisages such a system being put in place in the coming years.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT/ADVICE (HQ/ REGIONAL)

Technical support to DE is provided by the WHO Evaluation Office on the same ad hoc, by-request basis as is QA as described above. As noted above, such support is often requested, however, and Evaluation Office staff often serve on reference groups, evaluation management groups, and advisory groups for DEs.

Owing to very limited capacity of the WHO Evaluation Office, technical assistance has not been consistent across DEs. The DE framework described above, which is currently in draft, aims to address issues of how to ensure more consistently high quality and credibility of DEs through enhanced technical assistance measures.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

An internal community of practice exists, the Global Network on Evaluation (GNE). To date, however, it has served in a variety of other functions but has not yet been harnessed a platform through which to strengthen capacity development. Owing to resource constraints, there is currently no formalized, systematic approach to providing capacity development to those commissioning, managing or conducting DEs.

The DE framework described above, which is currently in draft, envisages a plan for redressing this gap. In addition, in May 2020 the WHO Evaluation Office will begin a series of informal capacity development workshops for its own staff (who, as indicated above, often provide QA and technical assistance to DEs in various capacities).

IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

Evaluation teams for DEs are selected through competitive processes by the respective evaluation manager, often through the inclusion of and consultation with other colleagues from the respective regional office or office away from headquarters.

The WHO Evaluation Office also maintains a consultant roster, which it refreshes at least annually and sometimes more frequently. DE evaluation managers often consult with the Evaluation Office to identify qualified consultants for the projects using the roster.

IMPARTIALITY PROVISIONS

Impartiality is defined in the WHO Evaluation Policy describe above. This norm is underscored in the draft DE framework described above. Selected evaluators are required to sign an impartiality pledge and a conflict of interest form.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

THE EVALUATION POLICY STATES THAT THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL SHALL ENSURE THAT THERE ARE ADEQUATE RESOURCES, WITHIN THE RANGE RECOMMENDED BY THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (JIU/REP/2014/6), TO IMPLEMENT THE BIENNIAL ORGANIZATION-WIDE EVALUATION WORKPLAN WHICH INCLUDES NOT ONLY THE EVALUATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED BUT ALL ACTIVITIES REQUIRED TO ENSURE THE STRENGTHENING OF THE EVALUATION CULTURE AND THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF EVALUATION CONDUCT ACROSS THE ORGANIZATION.

The Evaluation Policy also states that Deputy Directors-General, Regional Directors, Assistant Directors-General, Directors and Heads of WHO country offices must ensure that resources are adequate to implement their respective components of the Organization-wide evaluation workplan. It adds that an appropriate evaluation budget must be an integral part of the operational workplan of a programme and shall be discussed as necessary with stakeholders during the planning phase of each project/programme/initiative.

The Evaluation Policy also states that, in determining the amount required to finance the evaluation function in WHO, factors to be considered include: the Organization's mandate and size; the types of evaluation to be considered; and the

role of the evaluation function in institutionalization and support to strengthening decentralized evaluation, national capacities for evaluation and evaluation partnerships.

EVALUATION REPORT REPOSITORY/ DATABASE

WHO maintains a publicly available [repository/ database](#) of evaluation reports on its website. As indicated under QA-related cells above, however, unlike other agencies these reports are not yet externally assessed for quality.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

As indicated in the Evaluation Policy, “Recommendations contained in evaluation reports reflect the value added by the evaluation process. Each evaluation shall have an identified owner, such as the responsible officer of a cluster, programme, office or project. It is the responsibility of the owner to utilize the findings of the evaluation and develop an action plan for implementing the recommendations. The evaluation owner shall ensure that an appropriate management response is issued in a timely manner to the appropriate Deputy Director-General/Assistant Director-General at headquarters, or to the Regional Director in the regions and countries. The Director-General will establish a mechanism to ensure the effective follow-up of the implementation of evaluation recommendations in a systematic manner, coordinating efforts with the evaluation owners. Annual status reports on progress in the implementation of the recommendations will be submitted to the Executive Board through the Programme, Budget and Administration Committee.” Whereas management responses are produced on a consistent basis, in practice the monitoring of recommendations’ implementation is an area currently being strengthened.

OTHER INITIATIVES/SYSTEMS TO ENHANCE USE (EVIDENCE MAPS, SYNTHESIS, LEARNING EVENTS, ETC.)

Where strategically useful, mapping exercises and syntheses are undertaken – e.g., an Organization-wise synthesis of recurring issues raised in evaluations, audits and other exercises that are outstanding and require organizational action; on-going mapping of issues emerging in country programme evaluations (CPEs); and a formal synthesis of CPE issues and recommendations slated for 2020.

