DAC/UNEG Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of UNICEF

Annex 1, Terms of Reference

Introduction

1. The OECD-DAC Network on Development Evaluation (EvalNet) and the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) maintain a Joint Task Force to support professional Peer Reviews of the evaluation function of UN organizations. Each Peer Review is intended to identify good practice and opportunities to further strengthen the evaluation function in the agency under review, with a view to contributing ultimately to improved performance in international development cooperation and humanitarian assistance[1]. Sixteen Peer Reviews have been conducted to date.

2. A DAC-UNEG Peer Review of the evaluation function at the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was conducted in 2006[2]. Since then, many changes have occurred both within UNICEF and in the external environment. The 2006 Peer Review was followed by preparation of a comprehensive evaluation policy, approved by the UNICEF Executive Board in 2008. In 2013, the Executive Board approved a Revised Evaluation Policy[3], which requires UNICEF to undertake a peer review of the implementation of the evaluation policy, a requirement recently reiterated by the UNICEF Executive Board. Through the Joint Task Force, a Panel of professional evaluation peers has been assembled to conduct the Peer Review, with support from a consultant adviser (see Annexe A).

3. The independent peer review of UNICEF's evaluation function will assess the status and performance of the evaluation function, considering in particular to what extent it is fit for purpose, influential with key stakeholders (internal and external) and matched to UNICEF's evolving approach and organization as proposed in its Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The Peer Review will be conducted in line with the UNEG Peer Review framework,[4] which lays emphasis on three important principles: the independence, credibility, and usefulness of the evaluation function. UNEG recently revised its overall framework of norms and standards for evaluation[5] and this will provide a key reference point for the peer review. The peer review is intended to be forward-looking, providing guidance on how the evaluation function can be further strengthened to meet emerging challenges and opportunities both within the UN system and more broadly.

4. The primary audiences for the Peer Review are UNICEF Senior Management and the Executive Board, as well as the staff of the Evaluation Office and more widely across the organisation. The Peer Review report will be presented to the Executive Director and the Executive

---

[1] See UNEG, 2011, *UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function of UN organizations,* UNEG/REF(2011)1

[2] *Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), May 2006*. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/98

[3] UNICEF: http://www.uneval.org/document/download/2428

[4] *UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of Evaluation Function of UN Organizations,* approved by the Annual General Meeting of the UN Evaluation Group in 2011.

[5] UNEG: *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*, June 2016. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914

Board and made publicly available through the Web site of UNICEF Evaluation Office. The executive summary of the report will be prepared as a stand-alone text to help inform key external stakeholders such as implementing partners, major donors, and the broader evaluation community of the main findings and conclusions of the review.

5.   The Peer Review will also be presented to the members of UNEG and the DAC Evaluation Network for information and feedback on issues of evaluation quality and utility and the Peer Review Panel will provide feedback on the process to the DAC-UNEG Joint Task Force on Peer Reviews to contribute to the further development of the peer review instrument.

6.   This document sets out the Terms of Reference for the Peer Review of the evaluation function of UNICEF. It describes the background and rationale for the Peer Review, its purpose, the scope, the general approach, the methods, the time schedule and funding arrangements. A draft version of the document was revised and commented upon by the Peer Review Panel and shared with UNICEF Management.

Background

7.   The last DAC-UNEG Peer Review of UNICEF's Evaluation Function was conducted in 2006. Recommendations included; the need to develop a revised evaluation policy, presentation of costed evaluation work plans and evaluation recommendation compliance reports to the Executive Board, improving the clarity of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities vis-à-vis evaluation at the central, regional and country levels, strengthening aspects of evaluation selection (coverage) and quality assurance.

8.   In the intervening decade, many changes have taken place within UNICEF and in the external environment, and further changes are anticipated in the period of the next Strategic Plan 2018-2021. A follow up peer review is therefore timely.

9.   Some of the significant changes that have occurred since the last peer review within UNICEF's evaluation function include:

a) **Evaluation expenditure** has been steadily increasing, both in absolute terms and as percentage of programme budget. In 2016, UNICEF spent USD 35.5 million on evaluation across HQ units, regional and country offices which represents 0.7% of programme budget (up from 0.33% in 2011 and 0.5% in 2014 but still below the 1% target set out in the policy).

b) The number of **human resources** with "evaluation" in their job titles has levelled off around the 300 mark in the current strategic plan period (2013-2017). Within this number, the share of single-function staff has increased as has staff seniority, with 184 staff at level 3 or above in 2015 (compared to 158 in 2013 and 90 in 2008). At the central Evaluation Office, more sectoral specialists have been hired in recent years.

c) In terms of **evaluation coverage**, about three quarters of UNICEF field offices have completed at least one evaluation report in the 3-year period 2014-2016, leaving some 30-35 countries without coverage. In 2016, the central Evaluation Office published 9 evaluations and the decentralized function has produced about 90 reports. While the number of evaluations produced by the EO has been fairly stable, country and regional offices have completed fewer evaluations during the current strategic plan period that focused on higher-level results (i.e., at the outcome or impact levels). In 2013 and prior,

100+ mainly project/programme evaluations were published annually by UNICEF's decentralized evaluation function.

d) **Evaluation quality** has steadily improved in recent years. 77% of evaluations conducted in 2016 and quality-rated to date by external reviewers were considered good or excellent, as compared with 74% in 2014, 62% in 2012 and 36% in 2009.

10.   Some of the significant organizational changes within UNICEF relating to the evaluation function can be listed as follows:

- Approval of the first UNICEF Evaluation Policy (2008). This followed up on the 2006 Peer Review. An Executive Directive followed, providing guidance on strengthening the evaluation function in line with the UNICEF Evaluation Policy.
- Arrival of the current UNICEF Executive Director and an organizational refocus on equity for children (2010). The refocus on equity was accompanied by development of the Monitoring Results for Equity System (MoRES). In parallel, the Evaluation Office issued guidance on "How to design and manage equity-focused evaluations".
- Arrival of the current Director of the UNICEF Evaluation Office (2011)
- Review of the UNICEF Evaluation Function (2012). Conducted by external consultants, this review provided a snapshot of the status of the evaluation function and provided an informed basis for preparation of the Revised Evaluation Policy.
- Approval of the Revised Evaluation Policy (2013). The revised policy updated the previous evaluation policy. Inter alia, it provided, for the first time, a target for expenditure on evaluation.
- Approval of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (2013).
- Publication of the first Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2014-2017 (2013; updated and revised in 2015). The Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations – i.e. corporate level evaluations produced by the Evaluation Office – reflected the main outcome areas set out in the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The Plan continues to guide the choice of evaluation topics addressed by the Evaluation Office.
- Establishment of the Field Results Group (2014). Under a newly-established Deputy Executive Director post, the Field Results Group reinforced the focus on results and on performance monitoring in the field. While increasing the results orientation, it also gave additional responsibilities to monitoring and evaluation staff in regional and country offices.
- JIU review: "Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system" (see A/70/686) (2014). This landmark review found the evaluation function in UNICEF to be "above average and high", transitioning to the highest level of organizational maturity but with some issues requiring attention.
- UNGA Resolution on "Building capacity for evaluation of development activities at the country level" (see A/C.2/69/L.35) (2014). UNICEF is one of a handful of UN agencies giving attention to building country capacity for evaluation. The UN Resolution provided support for this aspect of the organization's work
- Internal reviews of (a) the GEROS quality assurance system and (b) the evaluation management response system (2015). The reviews were undertaken to identify

opportunities to further strengthen these key elements of the UNICEF evaluation function. Steps are being taken to address the recommendations of these reviews.

- Approval of the UNICEF Policy on Research Policy (2016). Collaboration between the "evidence functions" of evaluation, research and data collection and analysis has been an evolving aspect of UNICEF's approach, and includes the development of shared systems and activities.
- Self-assessment of the UNICEF evaluation function (2016). The self-assessment was designed to follow up the review undertaken in 2012, and to provide evidence and information for the scheduled external peer review. Overall, the results confirmed the view that the evaluation function was generally strong overall but with a number of issues in need of systematic attention.

11.   The external landscape has also evolved greatly since 2006. Fundamental issues regarding international development are being widely debated and discussed, including the role and organization of the UN system, the framing of the Agenda 2030 global sustainable development goals and stronger leadership by countries of their development processes. There is increasing recognition of the need for innovative financing mechanisms to support the SDG agenda including a stronger role for private sector, impact investing and philanthropy. Whilst, in addition, the greater urgency of migration will have profound effects on UNICEF's target populations. These discussions carry implications for evaluation in the UN, for example more emphasis on country-led evaluation, joint evaluation and arrangements for UN system-wide evaluation. In 2014, the UN General Assembly endorsed a Resolution (see A/C.2/69/L.35) calling for support to strengthen national evaluation systems.

12.   In the humanitarian field, the international architecture is changing, most recently in terms of commitments proposed at the World Humanitarian Summit. Also, the intensification and multiplication of complex emergencies present considerable evaluation challenges, such as joint or co-ordinated inter-agency evaluations of Level 3 emergencies.

13.   Increased attention is being given to evaluation of cross cutting themes such as equity, gender equality, environment, climate change, resilience and urbanization. Meanwhile, in a context of reduced resources, there is demand for greater attention to issues of efficiency and value for money.

14.   The field of evaluation is itself at a crossroads more generally with pressures from within and externally to become more relevant to ever more rapid cycles of decision making. It must make better use of rapidly available digital and mobile data, adopt new ways of visualizing and transmitting information and promote new ways of learning in a digital age. Evaluation must adjust to the rise and importance of monitoring, learning at scale (scaling up), the challenges of using 'big data', whilst acknowledging a resurgence of interest in participatory methods, data ownership, voice and agency for stakeholders and beneficiaries. Alongside these new dynamics discussions on evaluation focus, methodological choices and methodological rigour have continued and evaluators now grapple with technical and conceptual challenges of real-time evaluation, impact evaluation, evaluation of normative work, evaluation in complex settings, contribution analysis, evaluation of humanitarian principles and assessment of value for money.

15.   All of these factors may have major implications for the way UNICEF's evaluation function and leadership should evolve and position itself going forward.

Purpose of the Peer Review

16.   An independent Peer Review will help UNICEF to consider steps required to further strengthen its evaluation function so that it is fully fit for purpose and well-placed to make the best contribution to the work and strategic positioning of the organization whilst furthering developments in the field of evaluation.

17.   In line with this goal, the Peer Review will undertake an assessment of the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function at UNICEF, focusing on 1) the independence and credibility of the function; 2) the quality, use and follow up of evaluations across the organization to promote accountability, learning, and improvement; 3) the leadership, and vision shown by UNICEF's evaluation function, including its capacity to adjust to the changing environment.

18.   It will provide recommendations to the Executive Director, the Executive Board and the Evaluation Office aimed at improving the quality of the evaluation function generally, and specifically to inform discussions and decisions about the role, positioning, leadership, vision, resourcing (including capacity) and mandate of the UNICEF Office of Evaluation as well as arrangements for evaluation at decentralized levels.

Subject, Scope, and Limitations

19.   The Peer Review will assess both the strategic positioning of evaluation in UNICEF as well as its functioning at an operational level, including the analysis of those factors affecting the quality, credibility and usefulness of evaluations.

20.   The DAC-UNEG Peer Review follows an agreed framework with a blend of standardized and flexible elements to reflect the diversity of UN organizations and their respective evaluation arrangements. UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential. The Peer Review Panel will keep the organization's distinct mission and mandate, both in relation to humanitarian and development interventions, in view throughout.

21.   The core assessment question is: "Are the agency's evaluation policy, function and its products: independent; credible; useful and influential for learning and accountability purposes, as assessed by a Panel of professional evaluation peers against the UNEG Norms and Standards and the evidence base?"[6]

22.   The Revised Evaluation Policy (2013) will be the baseline reference for the Peer Review, although a brief review of developments since the 2006 Peer Review will provide useful background. Using the three criteria of independence, credibility and utility, the Peer Review Panel will focus on the adequacy of the present Evaluation Policy, on the efforts made for its implementation and on the central and decentralized evaluation arrangements in the light of UNICEF's corporate objectives and organizational structure. Based on the evidence canvassed and analysed, the Panel will submit recommendations to strengthen the UNICEF evaluation function overall.

23.   The Peer Review Panel will examine and comment on both operational and strategic issues including:

---

[6] UNEG, 2011, UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews in the Evaluation Function of UN organizations, UNEG/REF(2011)/1

A. The EVALUATION POLICY of UNICEF, in particular:

    a.   the extent to which the evaluation policy conforms with UNEG Norms and Standards, internal and external contextual changes and whether it needs to be updated;

    b.   how well-aligned is the UNICEF evaluation policy with other organisational policies or frameworks relevant to the evaluation function (notably, those concerning strategic planning and budgeting; results-based management and monitoring; research, data collection and analysis and knowledge management; and human resources management);

    c.   whether the policy includes and safeguards adequate provision of human and financial resources for evaluation at (a) central level and (b) decentralized levels; and whether it sets out clear arrangements for maintaining and updating technical skills and knowledge for evaluation within UNICEF;

    d.   how far the policy sets out clear functional and organizational arrangements to ensure that evaluation, both at central and decentralized level, contributes effectively to learning, accountability and performance improvement within UNICEF;

    e.   how far the policy sets out clear principles concerning harmonization and alignment of evaluation activities as well as partnerships for evaluation to promote evaluation use, influence and 'learning at scale'.

B. GOVERNANCE arrangements, including the following:

    f.   the organizational and functional relationships of the Evaluation Office with Management and the Executive Board of UNICEF;

    g.   mechanisms to protect financial and human resources for evaluation from influence which might undermine the independence and impartiality of both centralised and decentralised evaluation work, at all levels (noting also the appropriateness of any de-facto mechanisms);

    h.   arrangements for oversight of self-evaluation and decentralized evaluation activities;

    i.   contractual arrangements for the post of Director of Evaluation, including recruitment, performance management and termination;

    j.   mechanisms (both formal and informal) to provide the Director of Evaluation with adequate access and opportunities to contribute to key corporate processes and decisions, including the deliberations of the UNICEF Executive Board and safeguards in place to avoid conflict of interests between contribution to decision-making and later evaluations;

    k.   arrangements for periodic review of the evaluation function;

    l.   arrangements for the oversight and quality control of the decentralized evaluation function.

C. MANAGEMENT of the Evaluation Office, focusing on the following:

- Operational management

    m.   how far management arrangements, working procedures and the internal organization of the Office supports the fulfilment of evaluation policy commitments and the achievement of strategic evaluation objectives;

    n.   approaches used to plan and manage evaluations and follow up, including arrangements to manage the quality and duration of the evaluation process;

    o.   the development, provision and use of guidance, methods and tools to support and strengthen management of evaluations at central and decentralized levels;

    p.   how far the office provides effective oversight of the evaluation function and provides satisfactory reporting on evaluation performance across the organization.

- Leadership and vision.

    q.   the extent to which UNICEF Evaluation leaders and managers are seen as influential internally in the agency at headquarters and regionally/nationally – and how they can become more so;

    r.   how well UNICEF Evaluation embraces and integrates, new technologies in data collection and analysis, new thinking in innovation, trends and dynamics in evaluation in development, and the use of evidence more broadly at a meta level, beyond individual evaluations

D. EVALUATION PLANNING, including consideration of the following:

    s.   the methods and criteria used for strategic planning and prioritization of evaluation activities at all levels[7] and the extent to which topics selected for evaluation meet the needs and demands of UNICEF's key stakeholders, balancing accountability including on coverage, and learning;

    t.   how far topics selected reflect the strategic directions and concerns of the organization as well as the UN system and the wider humanitarian system. Particular attention will be given not only to the evaluation focus on children and young people, but also to emerging issues including challenges around the sustainable development goals, issues of innovation and new technologies, as well as cross cutting issues relating to equity and gender equality;

    u.   the balance of effort between corporate, joint and system-wide evaluation work;

    v.   the planning of decentralized evaluation activities;

    w.   the balance of effort between undertaking new evaluations and synthesising and disseminating existing findings and lessons.

E. EVALUATION QUALITY at each level of the organization, including attention to the following:

    x.   the quality and credibility of the evaluations, from the planning process through the conduct of the evaluations to the quality of the evaluation reports and of evaluation results);

    y.   the extent to which UNICEF evaluations integrate Human Rights and Gender Equality and Empowerment principles;

    z.   the independence of evaluation teams and team leaders;

---

[7] E.g (i) the use of trends scanning, and scoping of external context to inform what should be evaluated (ii) the use of external advisors in new areas of challenge to enhance evaluation methods and processes

aa.   ways in which the credibility and utility of the reports are enhanced, including how stakeholders are facilitated to comment on draft reports;

bb.   the adequacy of the quality assurance system;

cc.   the use of external quality reviewers, advisory panels etc.;

F. EVALUATION FOLLOW UP AND USE. Important aspects include the following:

dd.   the absorptive capacity of the organization, arrangements for managing evaluation results in terms of arrangements for knowledge management (including internal and external web presence);

ee.   the use of evaluation evidence in the development of new policies and programmes and in decision-making, to the extent that this can be assessed;

ff.   more widely, the impact of the evaluations, to the extent this can be assessed, including their influence in supporting learning, enhancing accountability and organizational improvement at the relevant levels;

gg.   the ways in which evaluation results are communicated and lessons used both within UNICEF and by others (such as member countries, donors, and cooperating partners);

hh.   similarly, the ways in which the results of joint evaluations and system wide evaluations are communicated and the lessons used by UNICEF staff and other stakeholders;

ii.   responsibilities for the follow-up of lessons and recommendations, including arrangements for preparation and implementation of a formal Management Response;

jj.   how follow-up is undertaken, monitored and accountabilities discharged;

kk.   the clarity and relevance of recommendations and how well management implements decisions based on evaluation recommendations in developing organisational policy, strategy and programming;

G. EXTERNAL INFLUENCE, PARTNERSHIPS AND POSITIONING. Engagement with, and influence on, external stakeholders including national partners, donors, NGO partners, and the global development/humanitarian evaluation community, including UNEG;

ll.   How influential is UNICEF in assessing and embracing the needs of stakeholders, and in 'leading the field' to respond to changing contexts. Is the nature and extent of participation in relevant networks, conferences and support for national evaluation capacity development appropriate given the stated aims of the function and the resources available?

mm.   How well does the UNICEF evaluation function support the capacity and skills of its stakeholders to use the results of evaluations for improved policies and programs.

nn.   How well does the UNICEF evaluation function communicate for influence, knowledge building, learning. How effectively does it promote the use of evidence and knowledge in development decisions and empowering stakeholders both internally and externally.

24.   By necessity, a professional Peer Review of the evaluation function is not a full-fledged evaluation that can comprehensively evaluate practices, processes, and outcomes in depth. The Panel will report on the limitations of its work.

Core Assessment Criteria

25.   As noted above, the Peer Review will apply three core criteria that need to be satisfied for evaluation functions and products to be considered of high quality:

26.   Independence of evaluations and the evaluation system(s). The independence of the evaluation function comprises two key aspects — behavioural independence and organizational independence.

- Behavioural independence entails the ability to evaluate impartially without undue influence by any party. This requires that the persons and entities undertaking the evaluation should be independent of those concerned with the policy, programme or activities to be evaluated, to avoid possible bias or conflicts of interest. Evaluators must have the full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially, without the risk of negative effects on their career development, and must be able to freely express their assessment.
- Organizational independence requires that the central evaluation function is positioned independently from management functions, carries the responsibility of setting the evaluation agenda and is provided with adequate resources to conduct its work. At the same time, in practice, the guarantees of independence are necessarily defined according to the nature of evaluation work, its governance and decision-making arrangements, and other factors. In this regard, the activities of the Evaluation Office can be expected to have greater degree of independence than evaluation activities at decentralized levels. Organizational independence also necessitates that evaluation managers have full discretion to directly submit evaluation reports to the appropriate level of decision-making and that they should report directly to an organization's governing body and/or the executive head. Independence is vested in the Evaluation Head to directly commission, produce, publish and disseminate duly quality-assured evaluation reports in the public domain without undue influence by any party.

27.   Credibility of evaluations. Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements that contribute to credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Credibility requires that evaluations are ethically conducted, managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competencies, and should report successes, as well as failures. Recipient partners should, as a rule, fully participate in evaluations in order to promote credibility and commitment on their side. Whether and how the organization's approach to evaluation fosters partnership and helps builds ownership merits close attention.

28.   Utility of evaluations. In commissioning and conducting an evaluation, there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is evident when it contributes in an effective and timely manner to organizational learning, accountability for results and informed decision-making processes. To have an impact on decision-making, evaluation findings must be perceived as credible, and relevant

and be presented in a clear and concise way. They should also respond to the different interests and needs of the many parties involved in the evaluation subject. However, measures to ensure the utility of evaluations are only partly under the control of evaluators. It is also critically a function of the interest of managers and member countries through their participation on governing bodies and in commissioning, receiving, and using evaluations. Evaluations may also contribute to knowledge as a public good, when agencies and organizations join together in creating 'linked up knowledge' and a common understanding of what works and what does not. Whilst no one organization can do this on their own, the Peer Review Panel will assess the role and contributions of the UNICEF evaluation function.

29.   The core criteria of <u>impartiality</u> and <u>transparency</u> will also be considered, as they are strongly related to the criteria of independence, credibility and utility. Impartiality is enabled by independence and is a fundamental element of the credibility of evaluations. Transparency is another fundamental element of credibility and is an important basis for the utility of evaluations[8].

Approach, methods and tools

30.   The UNICEF Evaluation Office is undertaking a self-assessment against UNEG norms and standards and results will be shared with the Panel. The framework for the self-assessment will be consistent with the ToR for the Peer Review and the evaluation framework that will be developed accordingly. This will be supplemented by further information to be assembled by the Panel's consultant advisor/s, based on a review of relevant documentation, interviews, round table discussions. The consultant advisor/s will also undertake a quality review of a sample of evaluation reports, which will include reports produced by the Evaluation Office and from decentralized evaluations. To assess the quality of evaluation reports, the Peer Review will use UNICEF's GEROS quality assessment tool, or adapt it to ensure consistency with UNEG and OECD/DAC quality criteria.. The consultant/s will also undertake a preliminary visit to discuss with the UNICEF Evaluation Office staff and gather relevant documentation. These activities will provide the basis for a preliminary assessment.

31.   Equipped with the preliminary assessment, members of the Peer Panel will conduct an initial visit in March 2017. This will include a round of meetings, interviews and focus group discussions with UNICEF staff, senior management and members of the Executive Board and key UNICEF external stakeholders. The Panel will also have the opportunity to inform Board members about the approach of the Peer Review and progress made. On the basis of these consultations, the Panel will prepare a draft report.

32.   Field visits by Panel members and the consultant team will be conducted with key UNICEF stakeholders. These will likely be 'opportunistic' visits undertaken by Panel members who may visit Regional and country offices for other professional tasks. The Panel will also seek opportunities to interact with field-based staff remotely and through existing networks in which UNICEF plays a key role (such as AfrEA, South Asia Conclave, CLEAR, etc.).

33.   A second Peer Review visit, proposed for May-June 2017, will present a draft report for discussion. Consultations will be held with members of the Executive Board and representatives of UNICEF management, most likely through a meeting of the internal UNICEF Evaluation Committee. A

---

[8] See UNEG: *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*, June 2016. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914

"peer exchange" session will also be arranged to allow a professional exchange of perspectives between the Panel, the Evaluation Office and other UNICEF stakeholders closely involved in evaluation. Reflecting on feedback received, the Panel will prepare a final report, including findings, conclusions and recommendations for further strengthening the evaluation function at UNICEF.

Reporting

34.   The final report of the Peer Review will present an overview of the evaluation function at UNICEF and key findings relating to its independence, credibility and utility, leadership and vision. The report will present conclusions and recommendations for action. The report will be a maximum of 50 pages in length, supplemented by an executive summary and annexes. The Executive Summary will be made available to key implementing partners and stakeholders, particularly to those consulted in the course of the peer review.

35.   The Panel Chair will submit the report of the Panel to the Executive Board through the Evaluation Office. It is expected that Management would submit a formal Management Response at the same session.

36.   The final report will also be provided to the joint DAC-UNEG Task Force, for dissemination among its respective constituencies and to interested cooperating partners. The Peer Panel will report on the Review's progress to UNICEF Evaluation Office and the joint DAC/UNEG Task Force and will provide the DAC-UNEG Task Force with feedback on the experience of the Peer Review to enable the members of UNEG and DAC evaluation network, to learn from experience at UNICEF and further strengthen the peer review mechanism.

Responsibility of the UNICEF Evaluation Office

37.   The UNICEF Evaluation Office serves as the main contact point within UNICEF for the Panel and its advisors. The Evaluation Office will provide requested information and data, including the following:

- Names and details of contact persons whom the Panel or its advisors wish to contact;
- Complete list of the UNICEF evaluations (2013-present);
- List of persons to meet in UNICEF Management and in the Executive Board;
- List of key implementing partners in regions
- Contact info of consultant evaluation team leaders, on request;
- E-library of evaluation products accessible via Internet.
- Organigram of UNICEF showing the position of Evaluation and UNICEF decision-makers.
- Documents outlining the leadership role that UNICEF plays in the UN system and in the broader development and evaluation fields.

38.   The Office will provide the Panel with a self-assessment prior to the start of the Peer Review. The Office will brief UNICEF and its Executive Board about the Peer Review. The Office will also submit the Panel's report and recommendations to the Executive Director and to the Executive Board.

39.   The budget for the Peer Review will be funded primarily by the UNICEF Evaluation Office (see section on Resources below).

Documents to be consulted (not exhaustive)

- UNEG/DAC Peer review (2006)
- 2012 review of the evaluation function
- All evaluation reports from across UNICEF (2013 - present)
- Guidelines, templates, and other evaluation tools as published by the Evaluation Office or other units
- Other relevant UNICEF documents including, as well as documents concerning RBM, monitoring, operational procedures, and risk management.
- Evaluation Policy, both 2008 and 2013 versions
- UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017

Persons to meet (by advisors and/or Peer Panel Members)

- UNICEF Evaluation Office Director and Staff
- The Executive Director (or his representative) and senior staff in UNICEF, including Regional Directors
- UNICEF Staff dealing with results-based management, knowledge systems, programme appraisal, management response on evaluations, good practices and portfolio quality improvement, as well as risk management and internal audit;
- Former evaluation consultant team leaders
- Staff members of a selected number of UNICEF units, including technical departments
- Staff members in regional, sub-regional, and country offices to be interviewed through teleconferencing or Skype
- Members of the UNICEF Board
- Representative of UNICEF Partners

Review Process and Schedule

40.   Peer Review activities will begin in November 2016; a preparatory information gathering phase will take place between December and February 2017, while the Peer Review Panel will undertake formal visits to UNICEF HQ in March 2017, and provide a final report for presentation to the Executive Board in September 2017.

41.   The Peer Review process has 6 main phases *(indicative timing is shown in brackets)*:

1. Preparation (October 2016): Mobilization of the Panel.
2. Fact-finding (December 2016-February 2017): the Evaluation Office will undertake a self-assessment. The consultant team will undertake extensive document review, may carry out a visit to UNICEF for consultations with EO and prepare a preliminary assessment. This will be discussed by Evaluation Office and Panel members (via videoconference).
3. First visit by the Panel to UNICEF HQ (March 2017); interviews with selected staff of relevant UNICEF units and Senior Management; analysis and triangulation of findings; preparation of draft report.
4. Field visits (tbc) (January-April)
5. Peer Exchange (September 2017): Second visit of Panel to UNICEF HQ for peer exchange; further consultations; presentation of key findings and conclusions to Senior Management and Executive Board members; preparation of final report, incorporating feedback from Senior Management and the Executive Board.

6. Presentation of Final Report (September 2017): at Executive Board session.

Resources

42.   The costs of the Peer Review will be covered as follows:

- The participation of the Panel members will be covered by their own organizations, or by UNEG resources.
- The costs of hiring consultant advisors will be covered by the Peer Review budget.
- The costs of external stakeholder consultations will be covered by the Peer Review budget, where appropriate
- Costs in UNICEF (including in-kind contributions of staff time) will be covered by the Evaluation Office.

43.   The Peer Review budget will be funded primarily by UNICEF Evaluation Office. It is expected that this will be less than $70,000 in total.

Annex A: Panel Composition

Following consultations with the UNEG/DAC Joint Task Force as well as with the UNICEF Evaluation Office, a Panel of professional evaluators has been assembled.

A number of important considerations were taken into account when composing the Panel membership: (i) relevant professional experience; (ii) independence: to avoid any potential or alleged conflict of interest or partiality, the Panel members do not have any close working relationship to UNICEF that might influence the Panel's position and deliberations; and (iii) institutional affiliations: members to be drawn from a variety of multilateral and bilateral development agencies, as well as from institutions in the South and transition countries.

The combination of these criteria together with the voluntary nature of serving on the Panel resulted in the following composition:

- Michael Spilsbury, Director Evaluation Office UNEP
- Per Øyvind Bastøe, Director, Evaluation Office, NORAD
- Nancy Macpherson, Managing Director, Evaluation Office, Rockefeller Foundation
- Anne-Claire Luzot, Chief Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office, WHO
- Shiv Kumar, Visiting Professor at the Ashoka University, Indian School of Business, and Harvard's Kennedy School of Government

The Panel will be assisted by a consultant advisor responsible for (a) data collection and information gathering; and (b) preliminary assessment of the collected information.

- Tullia Aiazzi, International Evaluation Consultant

Professional Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of UNICEF

Annex 2, Profile of Peer Review Panel members and consultants

Mike Spilsbury, Chair

Dr Spilsbury has more than 20 years of evaluation experience, including with the CGIAR on impact assessment. He has been a senior staff member of the UNEP Evaluation function since 2005, and its Head since 2013. Dr Spilsbury chaired the UNODC Peer Review and is currently UNEG Co-Chair of Peer Review sub-group.

Per Øyvind Bastøe, OECD/DAC Member

Currently the Evaluation Director at NORAD, Mr Bastøe was formerly at the World Bank and Asian Development Bank, as an RBM and Change Management Specialist. He also served on the executive boards the Inter-American Development Bank and the Inter-American Investment Cooperation.

Anne-Claire Luzot, UNEG Member

Currently Chief Evaluation Officer at WHO, Ms Luzot has a long experience in evaluation first as evaluator then as senior evaluation officer for 10 years in WFP and UNICEF. She brings important contextual knowledge and understanding of decentralized evaluation functions in various UN agencies and extensive experience in evaluation of humanitarian action and of institutional issues. She was a member of the Peer Review Panel for the Professional peer review of the evaluation function of the International Trade Centre.

Nancy McPherson, Foundation Member

Ms McPherson is the Managing Director for Evaluation at the Rockefeller Foundation where she served in that role from 2008-2017 managing the Foundation-wide evaluation. She has experience of managing evaluation functions at strategy, programme and grant portfolio levels and 25 years of experience in development evaluation in Asia and Africa with international development organizations, IUCN, the United Nations, multilateral and bilateral agencies. She is also the recipient of the 2015 American Evaluation Association's (AEA) Enhancing the Public Good Award, presented to an individual whose evaluation work has substantially contributed to the public good.

A K Shiva Kumar, Policy adviser and evaluation specialist

A development economist and professor, Dr Shiva Kumar is a visiting faculty member at the Harvard Kennedy School and Ashoka University in India. He has extensive experience in evaluation, and has been a regular contributor to human development reports. He serves as an advisor to UNICEF in India.

Tullia Aiazzi, international consultant

Ms Aiazzi has thirty years of professional experience in development, including at field level. She started contributing to evaluations as a consultant in the late 1990s, and worked for twelve years as evaluator and senior evaluator in FAO. Her experience includes evaluations at all organizational levels, research and analysis. Among her recent assignments, she supported as consultant the Professional Peer Review of the UNODC, and she was the main author of the UNEG working document "Evaluation in the SDG era: lessons, challenges and opportunities for UNEG".

Annex 3. Peer Review Normative Framework compared with UNEG 2016 Norms and Standards

Overarching question: 'Are the agency's evaluation function and its products: independent; credible; and useful for learning and accountability purposes, as assessed by a panel of professional evaluation peers against international standards and the evidence base.'

Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets	N. 1 - Within the United Nations system, it is the responsibility of evaluation managers and evaluators to uphold and promote, in their evaluation practice, the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed. In particular, they should respect, promote and contribute to the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development	
Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	**UNEG Norms**	**Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)**
A. Independence	N. 4 - Independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility, influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process. The independence of the evaluation function comprises two key aspects — behavioural independence and organizational independence. Behavioural independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence by any party. Evaluators must have the full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially, without the risk of negative effects on their career development, and must be able to freely express their assessment. The independence of the evaluation function underpins the free access to information that evaluators should have on the evaluation subject. Organizational independence requires that the central evaluation function is positioned independently from management functions, carries the responsibility of setting the evaluation agenda and is provided with adequate resources to conduct its work. Organizational independence also necessitates that evaluation managers have full discretion to directly submit evaluation reports to the appropriate level of decision-making and that they should report directly to an organization's governing body and/or the executive head. Independence is vested in the Evaluation Head to directly commission, produce, publish and disseminate duly quality-assured evaluation reports in the public domain without undue influence by any party.	
Disclosure policy		St. 1.5 - The organization should have an explicit disclosure policy for evaluations. To bolster the organization's public accountability, key evaluation products (including annual reports, evaluation plans, terms of reference, evaluation reports and management responses) should be publicly accessible.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)
B. Credibility	N. 3 - Evaluations must be credible. Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements of credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Evaluation results (or findings) and recommendations are derived from — or informed by — the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence. Credibility requires that evaluations are ethically conducted and managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competencies.	
Impartiality	N. 5 - The key elements of impartiality are objectivity, professional integrity and absence of bias. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including planning an evaluation, formulating the mandate and scope, selecting the evaluation team, providing access to stakeholders, conducting the evaluation and formulating findings and recommendations. Evaluators need to be impartial, implying that evaluation team members must not have been (or expect to be in the near future) directly responsible for the policy setting, design or management of the evaluation subject.	
Ethics	N. 6 - Evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the 'do no harm' principle for humanitarian assistance. Evaluators must respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, must ensure that sensitive data is protected and that it cannot be traced to its source and must validate statements made in the report with those who provided the relevant information. Evaluators should obtain informed consent for the use of private information from those who provide it. When evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, it must be reported discreetly to a competent body (such as the relevant office of audit or investigation).	St. 3.2 - All those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluations should conform to agreed ethical standards in order to ensure overall credibility and the responsible use of power and resources
Transparency	N. 7 - Transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability. Evaluation products should be publicly accessible.	
C. Utility	N. 2 - In commissioning and conducting an evaluation, there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is manifest through its use in making relevant and timely contributions to organizational learning, informed decision-making processes and accountability for results. Evaluations could also be used to contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders.	
Timeliness and intentionality		St. 4.1 - Evaluations should be designed to ensure that they provide timely, valid and reliable information that will be relevant to the subject being assessed and should clearly identify the underlying intentionality.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)
1. Evaluation Policy and governance of the evaluation function		
Enabling environment	N. 11 - Evaluation requires an enabling environment that includes an organizational culture that values evaluation as a basis for accountability, learning and evidence-based decision-making; a firm commitment from organizational leadership to use, publicize and follow up on evaluation outcomes; and recognition of evaluation as a key corporate function for achieving results and public accountability. Creating an enabling environment also entails providing predictable and adequate resources to the evaluation function.	
Institutional framework for evaluation		St. 1.1 - The organization should have an adequate institutional framework for the effective management of its evaluation function.
Evaluation policy	N. 12 - Every organization should establish an explicit evaluation policy. Taking into account the specificities of the organization's requirements, the evaluation policy should include a clear explanation of the purpose, concepts, rules and use of evaluation within the organization; the institutional framework and roles and responsibilities; measures to safeguard evaluation independence and public accountability; benchmarks for financing the evaluation function that are commensurate with the size and function of the organization; measures to ensure the quality and the use of evaluations and post-evaluation follow-up; a framework for decentralized evaluations, where applicable; and provision for periodic peer review or external assessment. The evaluation policy should be approved by the governing body and/ or the executive head to ensure it has a formally recognized status at the highest levels of the organization. References to evaluators in the policy should encompass staff of the evaluation function as well as evaluation consultants.	St. 1.2 - Organizations should establish an evaluation policy that is periodically reviewed and updated in order to support the evaluation function's increased adherence to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
Responsibility for the evaluation function	N. 13 - An organization's governing body and/or its executive head are responsible for ensuring the establishment of a duly independent, competent and adequately resourced evaluation function to serve its governance and management needs. The evaluation budget should be commensurate to the size and function of the organization. The governing body and/or the executive head are responsible for appointing a professionally competent head of evaluation and for fostering an enabling environment that allows the head of evaluation to plan, design, manage and conduct evaluation activities in alignment with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The governing body and/ or the executive head are responsible for ensuring that evaluators, evaluation managers and the head of the evaluation function have the freedom to conduct their work without risking their career development. Management of the human and financial resources allocated to evaluation should lie with the head of evaluation in order to ensure that the evaluation function is staffed by professionals with evaluation competencies in line with the UNEG Competency Framework. Where a decentralized evaluation function exists, the central evaluation function is responsible for establishing a framework that provides guidance, quality assurance, technical assistance and professionalization support.	
Head of Evaluation		St. 2.1 - The head of evaluation has the primary responsibility for ensuring that UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation are upheld, that the evaluation function is fully operational and duly independent, and that evaluation work is conducted according to the highest professional standards

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)
Responsiveness of the evaluation function		St. 2.3 - The head of evaluation should provide global leadership, standard setting and oversight of the evaluation function in order to ensure that it dynamically adapts to new developments and changing internal and external needs. The management of the evaluation function should include: - Raising awareness and/or building evaluation capacity; - Facilitating and managing of evaluation networks; - Designing and implementing evaluation methodologies and systems; - Ensuring the maintenance of institutional memory through user-friendly mechanisms; and
2. Management of evaluations		
Professionalism	N. 10 - Evaluations should be conducted with professionalism and integrity. Professionalism should contribute towards the credibility of evaluators, evaluation managers and evaluation heads, as well as the evaluation function. Key aspects include access to knowledge; education and training; adherence to ethics and to these norms and standards; utilization of evaluation competencies; and recognition of knowledge, skills and experience. This should be supported by an enabling environment, institutional structures and	
Competencies		St. 3.1 - Individuals engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should possess the core competencies required for their role in the evaluation process.
Selection and composition of evaluation teams		St. 4.8 - The evaluation team should be selected through an open and transparent process, taking into account the required competencies, diversity in perspectives and accessibility to the local population. The core members of the team should be experienced evaluators.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)
3. Evaluation Planning		
Evaluation plan and reporting		St. 1.3 - Evaluations should have a mechanism to inform the governing body and/or management on the evaluation plan and on the progress made in plan implementation. - The evaluation plan should be based on an explicit evaluation policy and/or strategy, prepared with utility and practicality in mind and developed with a clear purpose, scope and intended use for each evaluation (or each cluster of evaluations). - Plan preparations should include adequate consultations with stakeholders, especially the intended users. - The plan should be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations conducted under the framework. - The evaluation plan should have established, clear guidelines to ~~... fin...~~
4. Evaluation quality		
Human rights and gender equality	N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'	
Evaluation guidelines		St. 2.2 - The head of evaluation is responsible for ensuring the provision of appropriate evaluation guidelines. Evaluation guidelines should follow the UNEG Norms and Standards and incorporate its relevant elements. Although guidelines may need to be prepared for different types of evaluations or for different types of users, the guidelines should generally cover: - The roles and responsibilities in setting up, managing, conducting, quality controlling, reporting and disseminating evaluations; - The process of evaluation; - Stakeholder involvement; - Guidance on methodologies and quality control; - Reporting, dissemination and the promotion of learning; - For decentralized evaluations, the guidance should cover overall planning and resourcing.
Terms of reference		St. 4.3 - The terms of reference should provide the evaluation purpose, scope, design and plan.
Evaluation scope and objectives		St. 4.4 - Evaluation scope and objectives should follow from the evaluation purpose and should be realistic and achievable in light of resources available and the information that can be collected.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)
Methodology		St. 4.5 - Evaluation methodologies must be sufficiently rigorous such that the evaluation responds to the scope and objectives, is designed to answer evaluation questions and leads to a complete, fair and unbiased assessment.
Stakeholder engagement and reference groups		St. 4.6 - Inclusive and diverse stakeholder engagement in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations is critical to ensure ownership, relevance, credibility and the use of evaluation. Reference groups and other stakeholder engagement mechanisms should be designed for this purpose.
Evaluation report and products		St. 4.9 - The final evaluation report should be logically structured and contain evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations. The products emanating from evaluations should be designed to the needs of its intended users.
Recommendations		St. 4.10 - Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, clear, results-oriented and realistic in terms of implementation.
Quality assurance systems		St. 5.1 -The head of evaluation should ensure that there is an appropriate quality assurance system.
5. Follow-up and use of evaluations		
Evaluation use and follow-up	N. 14 - Organizations should promote evaluation use and follow-up, using an interactive process that involves all stakeholders. Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and/or management addressed by its recommendations that clearly states responsibilities and accountabilities. Management should integrate evaluation results and recommendations into its policies and programmes. The implementation of evaluation recommendations should be systematically followed up. A periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations should be presented to the governing bodies and/or the head of the organization.	
Management response and follow up		St. 1.4 - The organization should ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place to ensure that management responds to evaluation recommendations. The mechanisms should outline concrete actions to be undertaken in the management response and in the follow-up to recommendation implementation.
Communication and dissemination		St. 4.11 - Communication and dissemination are integral and essential parts of evaluations. Evaluation functions should have an effective strategy for communication and dissemination that is focused on enhancing evaluation use.
6. Networking and external relations		

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)
National Evaluation Capacity Development	N. 9 - The effective use of evaluation can make valuable contributions to accountability and learning and thereby justify actions to strengthen national evaluation capacities. In line with General Assembly resolution A/RES/69/237 on building capacity for the evaluation of development activities at the country level, national evaluation capacities should be supported upon the request of Member States.	

Professional Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of UNICEF

Annex 4, Bibliography and reference documents

1. 2008 UNICEF Evaluation Policy
2. 2013 UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
3. 2015 Evaluation Policy Brief
4. EAPRO Regional Evaluation Strategy, draft
5. Adapted UNEG evaluation reports Standards
6. Adapted UNEG Terms of Reference Checklist
7. Management Response Guidelines 2016
8. UNICEF Management Response Template
9. 2014: Standard Operating Procedures for timely preparation and implementation of management responses to evaluations commissioned by the Evaluation Office
10. 2010: Developing national capacities for country-led evaluation systems. A conceptual framework
11. 2011: How to design and manage equity-focused evaluations (Evaluation Working Paper)
12. 2002: Children Participating in Research, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) — Ethics and Your Responsibilities as a Manager
13. 2009: Directive - Strengthening the evaluation function in line with the Evaluation Policy
14. 2010: Guidance on prioritization of major evaluations at the decentralized level
15. 2012: Guidance for Management response to evaluations
16. 2012: Utilization – Maximising the Use of Evaluation Findings
17. 2015: Guidance Note for Conducting Country Programme Evaluability Assessments (DRAFT)
18. 2013: Strategic Guidance Note on Institutionalizing Ethical Practice for UNICEF Research
19. UNICEF Programme Policy and Procedure Manual, Chapter 3: Programme Preparation, Section 3.5: Results Based Programme Planning, 3.5.8 Evaluability Assessments
20. UNICEF Programme Policy and Procedure Manual, Chapter 6: Section 9, Evaluability
21. 2017: Programme Policy and Procedure Manual
22. Standard Operating Procedure for Research, Evaluation and Studies
23. Employment Sharing agreement, Evaluation Specialist, P-4, Cambodia, Malaysia, Myanmar
24. 2014: Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2014-2017
25. Plan for global thematic evaluations 2014–2017: review and update for 2016-2017
26. 2012: Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2012-2013
27. 2011: Annual report on the evaluation function and major evaluations in UNICEF
28. 2012: Annual report on the evaluation function and major evaluations in UNICEF
29. 2013: Annual report on the evaluation function and major evaluations
30. 2014: Annual report on the evaluation function and major evaluations
31. 2015: Annual report for 2014 on the evaluation function in UNICEF
32. 2015: Presentation of Annual Report 2014
33. 2016: Annual report for 2015 on the evaluation function in UNICEF
34. 2016: Presentation of Annual Report 2015
35. 2010 EO Annual Report
36. 2011 EO Annual Report
37. 2012 EO Annual Report
38. 2013 EO Annual Report
39. 2014 EO Annual Report
40. 2015 EO Annual Report
41. UNICEF Research, Studies and Evaluations in the CEE/CIS Region, Annual Report 2016, draft

42. EO Office Management Plan 2010-2011
43. EO Office Management Plan 2010-2011 Annex
44. EO Office Management Plan 2012-2013
45. EO Office Management Plan 2012-2013 Annex
46. EO Office Management Plan 2014-2017
47. EO organigram
48. Annual Work Plan 2010
49. Annual work Plan 2011 Mid-year update
50. Annual Work Plan 2012 activity numbers
51. Annual Work Plan 2013
52. Annual Work Plan 2014
53. Annual Work Plan 2015
54. Annual Work Plan 2016
55. Brief on Evaluation function
56. Terms of Reference Review Management Response
57. Expression Interest mapping exercise UNICEF NECD
58. Terms of reference mapping exercise UNICEF NECD
59. SOPs-Tors Research and Evaluation Committee
60. SOP-strengthening quality of research and evaluation
61. CEE/CIS Templates for quality assessment ToR, Inception report, draft report
62. Evaluation dashboard global overview
63. UNICEF Multi-Country Evaluations in the CEE/CIS region - Concept, process and lessons learned
64. Web pages of UNICEF and EO on evaluation
65. 2013: A Guide on how to use the New Global Evaluation Database and Global Evaluation Management Response Tracking System
66. 2015: PowerPoint Presentation on PRIME
67. 2015: PRIME User Guide
68. PRIME main view
69. PRIME Dashboard view
70. Evaluation dashboard budgets HQ and regions, 2016 and 2017
71. Comparison evaluation costs and programme budgets-SouthEast Asia 2016 evaluations
72. 2013: Review of UNICEF's Development Effectiveness 2009 – 2011
73. MOPAN 2016
74. 2013 Universalia Assessment of UNICEF's Evaluation Function
75. 2006, UNEG Peer Review
76. 2016, Internal Review of UNICEF's Evaluation Management Response (EMR) + Annexes
77. 2014, JIU analysis of the Evaluation Function in the United Nations System of UN evaluation function
78. Presentation of Evaluation function self-assessment_Evaluation Committee January 2017
79. 2017 Peer Review concept note
80. GEROS Methodology
81. GEROS 2011 MetaAnalysis report
82. GEROS 2012 MetaAnalysis report
83. GEROS 2013 MetaAnalysis report
84. GEROS 2014 MetaAnalysis report
85. GEROS 2015 MetaAnalysis report
86. GEROS 2009 report
87. GEROS 2010 report
88. 2016, GEROS External Assessment Report
89. 2016 Self-Assessment documents and reports

90. 2016: Evaluation Competencies for the UN System for Evaluators, Evaluation Unit Heads and Commissioners of Evaluation
91. 2016: UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation
92. UNEG Professional Peer Review Framework
93. Evaluation in the SDG era: lessons, challenges and opportunities for UNEG, Vol. I and Vol. II
94. UNDP Evaluation policy
95. Executive board decision evaluation 2016
96. Global Evaluation Committee ToR
97. Management perspective on the annual report for 2015 on the evaluation function in UNICEF
98. Compendium 2010 Executive board decisions
99. Compendium 2011 Executive board decisions
100. Compendium 2012 Executive board decisions
101. 2016 UNICEF Office of Internal Audit and Investigations 2015 annual report to the Executive Board
102. UNICEF management response to the annual report of the Office of Internal Audit and Investigations for 2015
103. Audit Advisory Committee for 2015
104. 2015 Management perspective on Evaluation report
105. Executive Board Report on the first and second regular sessions and annual session of 2015
106. Executive Board Report on the first and second regular sessions and annual session of 2014
107. Audit Advisory Committee for 2014
108. Executive Board Report on the first and second regular sessions and annual session of 2013
109. 2014 Management perspective on Evaluation report
110. Compendium 2014 Executive board decisions
111. Compendium 2015 Executive board decisions
112. Compendium 2016 Executive board decisions
113. Compendium 2013 Executive board decisions
114. Audit Advisory Committee for 2012
115. Audit Advisory Committee for 2013
116. Executive Board Report on the first and second regular sessions and annual session of 2016
117. UNICEF Strategic Plan 2013
118. UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017
119. End of cycle review Mid-term Strategic Plan, 2013
120. Integrated budget
121. Results framework Strategic Plan 2014-2017
122. Theory of Change Strategic Plan 2014-2017
123. Compendium partner contributions
124. Report on Regular Resources
125. Strategic Plan time table
126. UNICEF Annual report 2015
127. Executive board Work Plan 2017
128. UNICEF mission statement
129. UNICEF national committees
130. UNICEF organigram
131. UNICEF Research Policy
132. Taxonomy for research, evaluation and studies

Title	Name	Surname	Title	Department, unit, office	Organization	Country
			Annex 5. List of stakeholders met during the Professional Peer Review of the UNICEF Evaluation Function			
Mr	Oscar	Garcia	Director	Independent Office of Evaluation	IFAD	Italy
Mr	Alex	Vazquez			International Federation for Family Development	USA
Mr	Ziad	Moussa	President		International Organization for Cooperation on Evaluation	Lebanon
Ms	Myriam	Aman Soulama	First Counsellor		Permanent Mission of Burkina Faso to the United Nations	USA
Ms	Karine	Tardif	First Secretary		Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations	USA
Ms	Hélène	Merlot	Attaché		Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations	USA
Ms	Jessica	Berger			Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations	USA
Mr	Michael	Sanfey	First Secretary		Permanent Mission of Ireland to the United Nations	USA
Mr	Mario	Volpe	Attaché, Second Commission		Permanent Mission of Italy to the United Nations	USA
Mr	Joo	Won Park	Adviser		Permanent Mission of Korea to the United Nations	USA
Ms	Mayra	Bravo			Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations	USA
Ms	May-Elin	Stener	Ambassador, Deputy Permanent Representative		Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations	USA
Ms	Vilde	Vaeromvik			Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations	USA
Mr	Nicolas	Randin	Counsellor		Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the United Nations	USA
Mr	Eran	Nagan	First Secretary		Permanent Mission of the Netherlands to the United Nations	USA
Ms	Sonia	Serrao	Third Secretary		Permanent Mission of the Republic of Angola to the United Nations	USA
Mr	Dario	Loda	Senior Advisor- Education		Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations	USA
Mr	Marco	Segone	Director	Independent Evaluation Office	UN Women	USA
Mr	Indran	Naidoo	Director	Independent Evaluation Office	UNDP	USA
Mr	Omar	Abdi	Deputy Executive Director-Programmes	Office of the Executive Director	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Carlos	Acosta	Chief, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Bangladesh Country Office	UNICEF	Bangladesh

Title	Name	Surname	Title	Department, unit, office	Organization	Country
Mr	Eddie	Addai	Regional Chief, Programme and Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office	UNICEF	Kenya
Mr	Victor	Aguayo	Associate Director-Nutrition	Nutrition Section	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Kerry	Albright	Chief,Knowledge Management	Office of Research	UNICEF	Italy
Ms	Kate	Alley	Emergency Specialist	Emergency Programmes Division	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Nikola	Balwin	Knowledge Management Specialist	Office of Research	UNICEF	Italy
Mr	Edouard	Beigbeder	Country Representative	Bangladesh Country Office	UNICEF	Bangladesh
Mr	Krishna	Belbase	Senior evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Lori	Bell	Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser	CEE/CIS Regional Office	UNICEF	Switzerland
Ms	Emanuela	Bianchera	Knowledge Management Specialist	Office of Research	UNICEF	Italy
Mr	Samuel	Bickel	Regional Evaluation Adviser	Regional Office for South Asia	UNICEF	ROSA
Mr	Gerard	Bocquenet	Director	Private Funding and Partnership Division	UNICEF	Switzerland
Ms	Jo	Bourne	Associate Director	Education Section- Programme Division	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Matt	Brossard	Senior Advisor- Education	Education Section- Programme Division	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Geert	Cappelaere	Regional Director	Middle East and North Africa Regional Office	UNICEF	Jordan
Ms	Liliana	Choitea	Social Policy Specialist	Bolivia Country Office	UNICEF	Bolivia
Ms	Sarah	Cook	Director	Office of Research	UNICEF	Italy
Ms	Geeta	Dey	Administrative Assistant	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Patrizia	Di Giovanni	Deputy Country Representative	Kenya Country Office	UNICEF	Kenya
Mr	Paul	Edwards	Deputy Representative	Myanmar Country Office	UNICEF	Myanmar
Ms	Etona	Ekole	Chief	Field Results Group	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Lucia	Elmi	Representative	Tajikistan Country Office	UNICEF	Tajikistan
Mr	Fran	Equiza	Representative	Mali Country Office	UNICEF	Mali
Ms	Paloma	Escudero	Director	Division of Communication	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Manuel	Fontaine	Director	Emergency Programmes Division	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Malti	Gandhi	Chief, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	China Country Office	UNICEF	China
Ms	Roumiana	Gantcheva	Regional Chief of Monitoring and Evaluation	Middle East and North Africa Regional Office	UNICEF	Jordan
Ms	Jean	Gough	Regional Director	Regional Office for South Asia	UNICEF	Nepal
Ms	Deepa	Grover	Regional Adviser, Early Child Development	CEE/CIS Regional Office	UNICEF	Switzerland
Mr	Carlos	Gutierrez	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist	Bolivia Country Office	UNICEF	Bolivia
Ms	Shanelle	Hall	Deputy Executive Director- Field Results Group	Office of the Executive Director	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Henrik	Hartmann	Consultant	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA

Title	Name	Surname	Title	Department, unit, office	Organization	Country
Ms	Mirella	Hernani	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist-Focal Point for Innovation	Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office	UNICEF	Panama
Mr	Shodmon	Hojibekov	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist	Tajikistan Country Office	UNICEF	Tajikistan
Ms	Karin	Hulshof	Regional Director	East Asia and Pacific Regional Office	UNICEF	Thailand
Ms	Debra	Jackson	Health Specialist	Health Section	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Inoussa	Kabore	Regional Chief of Monitoring and Evaluation	West and Central Africa Regional Office	UNICEF	Senegal
Ms	Afshan	Khan	Regional Director	CEE/CIS Regional Office	UNICEF	Switzerland
Ms	Theresa	Kilbane	Senior Adviser Child Protection	Child Protection-Programme Division	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Sun Ah	Kim Suh	Representative	Bolivia Country Office	UNICEF	Bolivia
Mr	Colin	Kirk	Director	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Anthony	Lake	Executive Director	Office of the Executive Director	UNICEF	USA
Mr	George	Laryea-Adjei	Director ad interim	Data, Research and Policy Division	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Celeste	Lebowitz	Programme Assistant	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Jean-Claude	Legrand	Regional Adviser, Child Protection	CEE/CIS Regional Office	UNICEF	Switzerland
Ms	Kathleen	Lethsabo	Evaluation specialist, Education	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Anju	Malhotra	Principal Adviser Gender Rights &Development	Gender Rights and Development, Programme Division	UNICEF	
Mr	Paul	Manning	Director	Internal Audit & Investigation	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Erica	Mattellone	Evaluation Specialist	Cambodia, Malaysia and Myanmar Country Offices	UNICEF	Cambodia
Ms	Cynthia	McCaffrey	Director	Office of Global Innovation	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Eva	Mennel	Director	Human Resources	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Prashant	Menon	Consultant-Enterprise Content Management	Information and Communication Technology Division	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Lovemore	Mhuriyengwe	Knowledge Management Specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Jane	Mwangi	Evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Fatoumata	Ndiaye	Deputy Executive Director-Management	Office of the Executive Director	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Tetyana	Nikitina	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	Sri Lanka Country office	UNICEF	Sri Lanka
Mr	Mandeep	O'Brien	Associate Director-Multilateral & Intergovernmental Partner	Public Partnerships Division	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Ada	Ocampo	Senior evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Laura	Olsen	Evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Beth	Plowman	Senior evaluation specialist, Health	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Riccardo	Polastro	Regional Evaluation Adviser	East Asia and Pacific Regional Office	UNICEF	Thailand
Mr	Koorosh	Raffii	Senior evaluation specialist, Humanitarian	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Laurence	Reichel	Evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA

Title	Name	Surname	Title	Department, unit, office	Organization	Country
Mr	Abdoulaye	Seye	Evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Susana	Sottoli	Deputy Director	Programme Division	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Carrie	Stevenson	Senior Project Manager	Information and Communication Division	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Ian	Thorpe	Chief- Learning and Knowledge Exchange	Policy, Strategy and Network	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Tina	Tordjman-Nebe	Evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Jeremy	Toubkiss	Evaluation specialist, WASH	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Bikul	Tulachan	Evaluation Officer	Regional Office for South Asia	UNICEF	Nepal
Mr	Bastiaan	Van't Hoff	Regional Chief, Programme and Planning	Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office	UNICEF	Panama
Mr	Mathew	Varghese	Senior evaluation specialist	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Ursula	Wellen	Principal Advisor	Ethics Office	UNICEF	USA
Mr	Sanjay	Wijesekera	Associate Director	Water and Sanitation Section	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Pamela	Wridt	Evaluation specialist, Early Child Development	Evaluation Office	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Alexandra	Yuster	Associate Director	Social Inclusion and Policy	UNICEF	USA
Ms	Andrea	Cook	Director	Office of Evaluation	WFP	Italy
Mr	Joseph	Barnes	Evaluation Team Leader			United Kingdom
Ms	Julia	Betts	Evaluation Team Leader			United Kingdom
Mr	Andrew	Lawday	Evaluation Team Leader			United Kingdom
Mr	John	Mathiason	Evaluation Team Leader			USA
Ms	Elizabeth	Spier	Evaluation Team Leader			USA
Mr	Bruno	Valfrey	Evaluation Team Leader			France

Annex 6. Comparison of UNEG 2016 Norms and Standards against UNICEF 2013 Revised Evaluation Policy

Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets	N. 1 - Within the United Nations system, it is the responsibility of evaluation managers and evaluators to uphold and promote, in their evaluation practice, the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed. In particular, they should respect, promote and contribute to the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development		
Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	**UNEG Norms**	**Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)**	**UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy**
			3. This policy expresses the organization's commitment to demonstrate results, transparency and accountability through an independent and credible evaluation system, and supports the mission, mandate and strategic priorities of UNICEF. More widely, it is aligned with spirit and principles of the United Nations, and with the norms and standards defined by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)
A. Independence	N. 4 - Independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility, influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process. The independence of the evaluation function comprises two key aspects — behavioural independence and organizational independence. Behavioural independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence by any party. Evaluators must have the full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially, without the risk of negative effects on their career development, and must be able to freely express their assessment. The independence of the evaluation function underpins the free access to information that evaluators should have on the evaluation subject. Organizational independence requires that the central evaluation function is positioned independently from management functions, carries the responsibility of setting the evaluation agenda and is provided with adequate resources to conduct its work. Organizational independence also necessitates that evaluation managers have full discretion to directly submit evaluation reports to the appropriate level of decision-making and that they should report directly to an organization's governing body and/or the executive head. Independence is vested in the Evaluation Head to directly commission, produce, publish and disseminate duly quality-assured evaluation reports in the public domain without undue influence by		As far as possible, care must be taken to avoid conflicts of interest and to support the impartiality and independence of the evaluation function by separating programme management responsibilities from evaluation duties. 33. The Executive Director safeguards the integrity of the evaluation function and its independence by: (a) Maintaining appropriate arrangements for oversight and management of the evaluation function and protecting the independence within the organization of the Evaluation Office; 44. UNICEF offices should make arrangements for the effective management and governance of the evaluation function that protect the principles of impartiality and independence.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Disclosure policy		St. 1.5 - The organization should have an explicit disclosure policy for evaluations. To bolster the organization's public accountability, key evaluation products (including annual reports, evaluation plans, terms of reference, evaluation reports and management responses) should be publicly accessible.	Effective performance is characterized by: (g) Routine disclosure and timely communication of evaluation results; 57. All evaluations will be published on the evaluation pages of the UNICEF website unless, in exceptional cases, there are specific reasons not to do so. Any exceptions will be authorized by the Director of the Evaluation Office.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
B. Credibility	N. 3 - Evaluations must be credible. Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements of credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Evaluation results (or findings) and recommendations are derived from — or informed by — the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence. Credibility requires that evaluations are ethically conducted and managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competencies.		Credible evaluation reports associated to conduct of evaluations, including management arrangements by an evaluation manager of EMT that closely supervises the consultants; engagement with key stakeholders, balanced team composition; evaluation questions identified by EMT; evaluation design and risk assessment are adequate; quality review by EMT first and then by peers or external specialists; approval by head of office.
Impartiality	N. 5 - The key elements of impartiality are objectivity, professional integrity and absence of bias. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including planning an evaluation, formulating the mandate and scope, selecting the evaluation team, providing access to stakeholders, conducting the evaluation and formulating findings and recommendations. Evaluators need to be impartial, implying that evaluation team members must not have been (or expect to be in the near future) directly responsible for the policy setting, design or management of the evaluation subject.		Same as above: As far as possible, care must be taken to avoid conflicts of interest and to support the impartiality and independence of the evaluation function by separating programme management responsibilities from evaluation duties. 43. In UNICEF offices, management is expected to provide leadership for the evaluation function and direct management attention to planning, managing and using evaluations (Management includes all personnel with decision-taking power over the evaluation agenda, budget and staffing, and the utilization of evaluation results. Managers include not only the head of the office, but also other professional staff, notably deputies and the heads of sections). In this respect, effective performance is characterized by: (b) Appropriate institutional arrangements to safeguard the quality, impartiality and integrity of evaluation work, including systems to provide quality assurance at key stages in the conduct of evaluations; 44. UNICEF offices should make arrangements for the effective management and governance of the evaluation function that protect the principles of impartiality and independence.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Ethics	N. 6 - Evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the 'do no harm' principle for humanitarian assistance. Evaluators must respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, must ensure that sensitive data is protected and that it cannot be traced to its source and must validate statements made in the report with those who provided the relevant information. Evaluators should obtain informed consent for the use of private information from those who provide it. When evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, it must be reported discreetly to a competent body (such as the relevant office of audit or investigation).	St. 3.2 - All those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluations should conform to agreed ethical standards in order to ensure overall credibility and the responsible use of power and resources	33. The Executive Director safeguards the integrity of the evaluation function and its independence by a number of measures. Same as above: 43. In UNICEF offices, management is expected to provide leadership for the evaluation function and direct management attention to planning, managing and using evaluations (Management includes all personnel with decision-taking power over the evaluation agenda, budget and staffing, and the utilization of evaluation results. Managers include not only the head of the office, but also other professional staff, notably deputies and the heads of sections). In this respect, effective performance is characterized by: (b) Appropriate institutional arrangements to safeguard the quality, impartiality and integrity of evaluation work, including systems to provide quality assurance at key stages in the conduct of evaluations; 54. A set of key steps have been shown to lead to useful and credible evaluation results. The steps for each evaluation are as follows: (e) When a preliminary risk assessment deems it necessary, an ethical review is conducted by an objective and qualified body; 26. Evaluation also helps UNICEF to fulfil its commitment to equity and gender equality. Evaluations will assess how far equity and gender equality has been addressed in the formulation, design and implementation of policies, advocacy and programmes, in particular the steps taken to identify the needs and rights of disadvantaged and marginalized children and women and the extent to which interventions have contributed towards meeting their needs, realizing their rights and recognizing their potential. As far as possible, evaluations will be conducted in ways that allow the voices of children, women and disadvantaged groups to be heard. UNICEF follows UNEG guidance on the conduct of gender-responsive evaluation. (c) The composition of the evaluation team is balanced in terms of gender and geographical diversity, and includes professionals from the region or country concerned in the evaluation; (f) The evaluation design and methods are clearly presented in the inception phase and are quality reviewed. The

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Transparency	N. 7 - Transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability. Evaluation products should be publicly accessible.		3. This policy expresses the organization's commitment to demonstrate results, transparency and accountability through an independent and credible evaluation system, and supports the mission, mandate and strategic priorities of UNICEF. More widely, it is aligned with spirit and principles of the United Nations, and with the norms and standards defined by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). 54. (d) Keeping in view the eventual use of the evaluation, the key questions, focus and scope to be addressed by the evaluation are identified at the outset by the EMT, and formulated in the terms of reference, which meet UNEG standards. They are shared with stakeholders, promoting transparency and engagement, and are reviewed for quality by peers or by external specialists (in the case of country offices, the regional office should provide quality assurance);

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
C. Utility	N. 2 - In commissioning and conducting an evaluation, there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is manifest through its use in making relevant and timely contributions to organizational learning, informed decision-making processes and accountability for results. Evaluations could also be used to contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders.		13. Evaluation at UNICEF unequivocally serves the organization's mission, and supports UNICEF in fulfilling its mandate. By supporting organizational learning and accountability, evaluation aims to help UNICEF continually to improve its performance and results. 14. Evaluation in UNICEF serves to support planning and decision-making, and to provide a basis for informed advocacy — aimed at promoting the well-being of all children, everywhere. In focusing on the substantive rationale, value and performance of interventions and institutional functions, evaluation serves to improve results and stakeholder satisfaction. It carries out this function at all levels of the organization, applicable in all contexts, from humanitarian crisis to transition situations to more steady development environments. Use 21. Evaluations should be useful. Utility and intentionality are key standards to be addressed in any evaluation activity, and the intended use of an evaluation should determine the choice of evaluation approach and methodology.
Timeliness and intentionality		St. 4.1 - Evaluations should be designed to ensure that they provide timely, valid and reliable information that will be relevant to the subject being assessed and should clearly identify the underlying intentionality.	24. Evaluation results are of limited value unless they are acted upon by stakeholders and timely steps taken to implement evaluation recommendations. This aspect is covered more fully below in the section on performance standards. (b) Conducting evaluations, especially preparing (on the basis of consultations with the Executive Board, senior management and other stakeholders) a Global Evaluation Plan, laying out strategic priorities for evaluation and identifying major global thematic evaluations to be undertaken independently by the Evaluation Office; designing and managing global evaluations in line with international standards of best practice; and providing timely dissemination of the results for action by management and other stakeholders; (b) Planning and resource allocation, especially preparing and updating annually a comprehensive integrated monitoring and evaluation plan (IMEP) for the country programme, setting out a clearly costed programme of evaluations that meet the coverage guidelines of the policy and provide timely evidence for strategic review moments; (g) Routine disclosure and timely communication of evaluation results. 47. Evaluations plans need to fulfil the following criteria: (e) Timely in terms of scheduling activities, to meet given end uses;

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
1. Evaluation Policy and governance of the evaluation function			
Enabling environment	N. 11 - Evaluation requires an enabling environment that includes an organizational culture that values evaluation as a basis for accountability, learning and evidence-based decision-making; a firm commitment from organizational leadership to use, publicize and follow up on evaluation outcomes; and recognition of evaluation as a key corporate function for achieving results and public accountability. Creating an enabling environment also entails providing predictable and adequate resources to the evaluation function.		33. The Executive Director safeguards the integrity of the evaluation function and its independence by: (b) Fostering a culture of accountability, learning and improvement, which creates demand for evaluation and draws upon evaluation; (c) Supporting the necessary provision of staffing and budgetary resources for evaluation across the organization. By supporting organizational learning and accountability, evaluation aims to help UNICEF continually to improve its performance and results. (c) At the country level, evaluation is especially important in supporting accountability and learning in relation to the country programme, and country teams may commission evaluations in support of national goals. (Detailed description of Accountabilities at the various level for evaluation). 45. To be useful, evaluations must contribute to organizational learning, accountability and decision-making. 48. Coverage is a key consideration in evaluation planning. Globally, for the purpose of accountability and for organizational learning, it is important that evaluation is able to present a representative and unbiased picture of UNICEF performance and results and that the organization's key policies, strategies and important areas for advocacy should be informed by relevant and reliable evaluation evidence. At regional and country levels, it is likewise important to address policy and programming priorities and demonstrate development effectiveness through evaluation. From an accountability perspective, areas of high programme expenditure should be matched by proportionate levels of evaluation effort. However, evaluations should also be undertaken to support learning, innovation and risk management. 70. For many country programmes, it will be necessary to prepare a substantial programme of high-quality evaluations, covering humanitarian response as well as regular development programming. Such a programme of major evaluations should satisfy accountability requirements and provide a robust base for learning and improvement; it will usually require budgetary provision well above 1 per cent of programme spending.

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Institutional framework for evaluation		St. 1.1 - The organization should have an adequate institutional framework for the effective management of its evaluation function.	Institutional framework 44. UNICEF offices should make arrangements for the effective management and governance of the evaluation function that protect the principles of impartiality and independence. Evaluation staff and team members must be able to conduct their work free of undue influence or restrictions, and should be aware of the relevant safeguards and other elements of the UNEG evaluation standards. This means that staff should not design or manage evaluations of programmes for which they have held direct responsibility, and that appropriate arrangements should be in place to avoid or resolve conflicts of interest. Likewise, members of the evaluation team must have had no direct responsibilities for the intervention being evaluated, nor expect such responsibilities in the near future.
Evaluation policy	N. 12 - Every organization should establish an explicit evaluation policy. Taking into account the specificities of the organization's requirements, the evaluation policy should include a clear explanation of the purpose, concepts, rules and use of evaluation within the organization; the institutional framework and roles and responsibilities; measures to safeguard evaluation independence and public accountability; benchmarks for financing the evaluation function that are commensurate with the size and function of the organization; measures to ensure the quality and the use of evaluations and post-evaluation follow-up; a framework for decentralized evaluations, where applicable; and provision for periodic peer review or external assessment. The evaluation policy should be approved by the governing body and/ or the executive head to ensure it has a formally recognized status at the highest levels of the organization. References to evaluators in the policy should encompass staff of the evaluation function as well as evaluation consultants.	St. 1.2 - Organizations should establish an evaluation policy that is periodically reviewed and updated in order to support the evaluation function's increased adherence to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation.	2. The revised Evaluation Policy governs the organization's evaluation function and provides a comprehensive framework for all evaluation activities undertaken by UNICEF. It addresses not only the conduct of evaluations and the use of evaluation results, but also the development of the evaluation function within UNICEF and its role in strengthening evaluation capacity among national partners. The policy is intended to inform and guide UNICEF staff and stakeholders about the purpose and contribution of evaluation at UNICEF and the organization's expectations and requirements regarding the conduct of evaluation activities. It applies to the organization's work at all levels, and across all contexts, including humanitarian situations. 3. This policy expresses the organization's commitment to demonstrate results, transparency and accountability through an independent and credible evaluation system, and supports the mission, mandate and strategic priorities of UNICEF. More widely, it is aligned with spirit and principles of the United Nations, and with the norms and standards defined by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Responsibility for the evaluation function	N. 13 - An organization's governing body and/or its executive head are responsible for ensuring the establishment of a duly independent, competent and adequately resourced evaluation function to serve its governance and management needs. The evaluation budget should be commensurate to the size and function of the organization. The governing body and/or the executive head are responsible for appointing a professionally competent head of evaluation and for fostering an enabling environment that allows the head of evaluation to plan, design, manage and conduct evaluation activities in alignment with the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. The governing body and/ or the executive head are responsible for ensuring that evaluators, evaluation managers and the head of the evaluation function have the freedom to conduct their work without risking their career development. Management of the human and financial resources allocated to evaluation should lie with the head of evaluation in order to ensure that the evaluation function is staffed by professionals with evaluation competencies in line with the UNEG Competency Framework. Where a decentralized evaluation function exists, the central evaluation function is responsible for establishing a framework that provides guidance, quality assurance, technical assistance and professionalization support.		33. The Executive Director safeguards the integrity of the evaluation function and its independence by: (a) Maintaining appropriate arrangements for oversight and management of the evaluation function and protecting the independence within the organization of the Evaluation Office; (b) Fostering a culture of accountability, learning and improvement, which creates demand for evaluation and draws upon evaluation; (c) Supporting the necessary provision of staffing and budgetary resources for evaluation across the organization. 35: Commitments: (a) Governance and accountability; (b) conducting evaluations; (c) partnerships for evaluations;(d) Knowledge management for evaluation; (e) Development and professionalization of the UNICEF evaluation function 36. The Director of the Evaluation Office is accountable for the commitments listed above. The Director of the Evaluation Office is appointed by the Executive Director for a term of four years (starting with the initial appointment of the next director after the approval of the Evaluation Policy), renewable once for a maximum of four years. He or she reports to the Executive Director, with day-to-day supervision by the Deputy Executive Director (Management) and direct access to the Executive Director, as needed. To minimize potential conflicts of interest, the Director of the Evaluation Office is barred from re-entry into the organization after the expiry of his or her term.
Head of Evaluation		St. 2.1 - The head of evaluation has the primary responsibility for ensuring that UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation are upheld, that the evaluation function is fully operational and duly independent, and that evaluation work is conducted according to the highest professional standards.	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Responsiveness of the evaluation function		St. 2.3 - The head of evaluation should provide global leadership, standard setting and oversight of the evaluation function in order to ensure that it dynamically adapts to new developments and changing internal and external needs. The management of the evaluation function should include: - Raising awareness and/or building evaluation capacity; - Facilitating and managing of evaluation networks; - Designing and implementing evaluation methodologies and systems; - Ensuring the maintenance of institutional memory through user-friendly mechanisms; and - Promoting the systematic compilation of lessons.	Same as above: commitments in para 35: (e) Development and professionalization of the UNICEF evaluation function, especially promoting strategies and systems to build internal evaluation capacity; developing and sharing innovative approaches and methodologies for evaluation work; providing guidance and support to offices in designing and staffing the function and to staff in long-term career development
2. Management of evaluations			
Professionalism	N. 10 - Evaluations should be conducted with professionalism and integrity. Professionalism should contribute towards the credibility of evaluators, evaluation managers and evaluation heads, as well as the evaluation function. Key aspects include access to knowledge; education and training; adherence to ethics and to these norms and standards; utilization of evaluation competencies; and recognition of knowledge, skills and experience. This should be supported by an enabling environment, institutional structures and adequate		35, one commitment: (e) Development and professionalization of the UNICEF evaluation function, especially promoting strategies and systems to build internal evaluation capacity; developing and sharing innovative approaches and methodologies for evaluation work; providing guidance and support to offices in designing and staffing the function and to staff in long-term career development

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Competencies		St. 3.1 - Individuals engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should possess the core competencies required for their role in the evaluation process.	64. High-quality evaluation requires sound technical and management skills. This requires that: (a) Staff, consultants and other personnel engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities possess core evaluation competencies;
Selection and composition of evaluation teams		St. 4.8 - The evaluation team should be selected through an open and transparent process, taking into account the required competencies, diversity in perspectives and accessibility to the local population. The core members of the team should be experienced evaluators.	See above

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
3. Evaluation Planning			
Evaluation plan and reporting		St. 1.3 - Evaluations should have a mechanism to inform the governing body and/or management on the evaluation plan and on the progress made in plan implementation. - The evaluation plan should be based on an explicit evaluation policy and/or strategy, prepared with utility and practicality in mind and developed with a clear purpose, scope and intended use for each evaluation (or each cluster of evaluations). - Plan preparations should include adequate consultations with stakeholders, especially the intended users. - The plan should be supported with adequate human and financial resources in order to ensure the quality of evaluations conducted under the framework. - The evaluation plan should have established, clear	27. National ownership and leadership. Evaluation in UNICEF follows the organization's commitment to the principles of national ownership of development processes and country-led programming. UNICEF seeks to help national authorities to evaluate their own programmes and to contribute to the strengthening of evaluation capacity in programme countries. Whenever possible, UNICEF evaluations must be planned and conducted in partnership with national authorities, addressing issues relevant to the national development agenda. 32. The Executive Board exercises oversight of the evaluation function in UNICEF. It: (b) Endorses the Global Evaluation Plan, listing major evaluations to be managed by the Evaluation Office; 35. The Evaluation Office provides global leadership of the evaluation function, with accountabilities in the following areas: (b) Conducting evaluations, especially preparing (on the basis of consultations with the Executive Board, senior management and other stakeholders) a Global Evaluation Plan, laying out strategic priorities for evaluation and identifying major global thematic evaluations to be undertaken independently by the Evaluation Office; 37. Division directors are responsible for planning, resourcing and commissioning evaluations of the global policies and initiatives for which they are accountable, and for responding to relevant evaluation lessons and recommendations. 40. Country offices: (b) Planning and resource allocation, especially preparing and updating annually a comprehensive integrated monitoring and evaluation plan (IMEP) for the country programme, setting out a clearly costed programme of evaluations that meet the coverage guidelines of the policy and provide timely evidence for strategic review moments;
4. Evaluation quality			

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Human rights and gender equality	N. 8 - The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'		See above on gender and ethics; no mention of human rights
Evaluation guidelines		St. 2.2 - The head of evaluation is responsible for ensuring the provision of appropriate evaluation guidelines. Evaluation guidelines should follow the UNEG Norms and Standards and incorporate its relevant elements. Although guidelines may need to be prepared for different types of evaluations or for different types of users, the guidelines should generally cover: - The roles and responsibilities in setting up, managing, conducting, quality controlling, reporting and disseminating evaluations; - The process of evaluation; - Stakeholder involvement; - Guidance on methodologies and quality control; - Reporting, dissemination and the promotion of learning; - For decentralized evaluations, the guidance	Same as above: commitments in para 35: (e) Development and professionalization of the UNICEF evaluation function, especially promoting strategies and systems to build internal evaluation capacity; developing and sharing innovative approaches and methodologies for evaluation work; providing guidance and support to offices in designing and staffing the function and to staff in long-term career development
Terms of reference		St. 4.3 - The terms of reference should provide the evaluation purpose, scope, design and plan	Not in the policy, but in the templates

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Evaluation scope and objectives		St. 4.4 - Evaluation scope and objectives should follow from the evaluation purpose and should be realistic and achievable in light of resources available and the information that can be	Not in the policy, but in the templates
Methodology		St. 4.5 - Evaluation methodologies must be sufficiently rigorous such that the evaluation responds to the scope and objectives, is designed to answer evaluation questions and leads to a complete, fair and unbiased assessment.	Not in the policy, but in the templates
Stakeholder engagement and reference groups		St. 4.6 - Inclusive and diverse stakeholder engagement in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations is critical to ensure ownership, relevance, credibility and the use of evaluation. Reference groups and other stakeholder engagement mechanisms should be designed for this purpose.	Commitments para 35: (b) Conducting evaluations, especially preparing (on the basis of consultations with the Executive Board, senior management and other stakeholders) a Global Evaluation Plan, laying out strategic priorities for evaluation and identifying major global thematic evaluations to be undertaken independently by the Evaluation Office; designing and managing global evaluations in line with international standards of best practice; and providing timely dissemination of the results for action by management and other stakeholders;
Evaluation report and products		St. 4.9 - The final evaluation report should be logically structured and contain evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations. The products emanating from evaluations should be designed to the needs of its	Not in the policy, but in the templates

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Recommendations		St. 4.10 - Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, clear, results-oriented and realistic in terms of implementation.	Not in the policy, but in the templates
Quality assurance systems		St. 5.1 -The head of evaluation should ensure that there is an appropriate quality assurance system	Commitments para 35: maintaining a comprehensive quality assurance system to gauge the quality and coverage of UNICEF evaluations;

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
5. Follow-up and use of evaluations			
Evaluation use and follow-up	N. 14 - Organizations should promote evaluation use and follow-up, using an interactive process that involves all stakeholders. Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and/or management addressed by its recommendations that clearly states responsibilities and accountabilities. Management should integrate evaluation results and recommendations into its policies and programmes. The implementation of evaluation recommendations should be systematically followed up. A periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations should be presented to the governing bodies and/or the head of the organization.		See above for use. 24. Evaluation results are of limited value unless they are acted upon by stakeholders and timely steps taken to implement evaluation recommendations. This aspect is covered more fully below in the section on performance standards. 32. The Executive Board exercises oversight of the evaluation function in UNICEF. It (c) Draws on the findings and recommendations of evaluations for the purposes of oversight and approval of corporate policy, strategy and programmes. On follow-up: 34. The Global Evaluation Committee advises the Executive Director on evaluation matters. The Committee reviews UNICEF evaluation reports of corporate relevance, and can endorse recommendations contained in the reports and review follow-up reports on their implementation. 37. Division directors are responsible for planning, resourcing and commissioning evaluations of the global policies and initiatives for which they are accountable, and for responding to relevant evaluation lessons and recommendations. 39. Regional offices, under the leadership of the regional director, provide regional leadership of the evaluation function in the following areas: (c) Conducting evaluations, especially multi-country or regional thematic evaluations, as decided by the regional management team or regional evaluation committees; informing regional stakeholders of relevant results; and responding to evaluation recommendations; (the same applies to country
Management response and follow up		St. 1.4 - The organization should ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place to ensure that management responds to evaluation recommendations. The mechanisms should outline concrete actions to be undertaken in the management response and in the follow-up to recommendation implementation.	Utilization, dissemination and disclosure: 55. Completed evaluations that are not properly utilized represent wasted investment and missed opportunities to improve programming for children and their communities. UNICEF offices must prepare a formal management response and make appropriate arrangements to maximize the use of evaluation results. For each evaluation, the office should: (b) Prepare a formal management response, with the active participation of concerned stakeholders, which reacts to the evaluation recommendations; and takes follow-up action to implement agreed recommendations. Where recommendations are rejected or only partially accepted, the rationale should be noted. Regional offices should maintain oversight of the management response process;

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
Communication and dissemination		St. 4.11 - Communication and dissemination are integral and essential parts of evaluations. Evaluation functions should have an effective strategy for communication and dissemination that is focused on enhancing evaluation use.	

Main and sub-criteria; areas of focus	UNEG Norms	Relevant UNEG Standards (only complementary ones)	UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy
6. Networking and external relations			
National Evaluation Capacity Development	N. 9 - The effective use of evaluation can make valuable contributions to accountability and learning and thereby justify actions to strengthen national evaluation capacities. In line with General Assembly resolution A/RES/69/237 on building capacity for the evaluation of development activities at the country level, national evaluation capacities should be supported upon the request of Member States.		National evaluation capacity development standards 58. Given the diversity of development needs and situations, the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system emphasized the ownership of development processes by Member States and the need for flexible, country-led development efforts, with continued support from United Nations agencies for technical assistance and capacity development, where needed. UNICEF shares this commitment to support the development of national capacities, including for evaluation. 59. UNICEF has played a significant role in NECD activities in the past and, with partners, will continue to do so. However, NECD needs are too large for UNICEF to be the main or sole supporter; therefore, the way forward is through collaboration with United Nations agencies and other partners. Although offices will need to be selective, it is expected that UNICEF would support the following: (a) Establishment and strengthening of national evaluation systems; (b) Strengthening of sectoral monitoring and evaluation or management information systems; (c) Training in monitoring and evaluation concepts and use of evidence; (d) Inclusion of NECD objectives within major programme evaluations; (e) Advocacy for and investment in country-led evaluations as well as use of evidence from such evaluations. 60. Although approaches to NECD are still evolving and performance standards are not yet well-defined, a sound approach will set out clear strategies tailored to the needs and capabilities of different partners — within national governments or the national authorities as a whole; various segments of civil society, including national evaluation associations; and operational partners. Strategies should take particular steps to involve disadvantaged groups or those underrepresented in national institutions. Agreement should be reached among partners about the priorities for action and the means of monitoring progress. Strategies should focus less on individual skills training