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1. Mandate and Policy

Mandate
GA 59/250
Resolution of 2004 for UN System

Ensuring organizational learning, transparency & accountability of UNDP programmes and operations

Evaluation Policy of UNDP

http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.htm
(1)...outputs and outcomes of the EO

- **Organizational learning:**
  Evaluation processes designed to maximize engagement and in-process learning — reflecting on UNDP values, policies and programmes against performance at all levels (global, regional, country and local)

- **Actioning for accountability:**
  Units obliged to respond to EO recommendations — action thereof tracked and reported against

- **Transparency:**
  Results generated by EO shared globally and used by different forums

- **Knowledge generation:**
  EO evaluations extend the evaluation field through developing and enhancing methodologies around development evaluation
2. UNDP Programmes and Operations

- 166 countries in 5 Regions

- National Goals and Priorities
  - United Nations Development Framework
  - UNDP Focus Areas
    - Poverty and MDG
    - Democratic governance
    - Crisis prevention and recovery
    - Environment and sustainability development
  - Cross-cutting themes

- Programs
  - Global
  - Regional
  - Country
  - Others

- Non-Project operations
  (advisory, advocacy, standard setting/normative, coordination, mobilization)
3. Quality of the Evaluation Function of EO

*Quality Assurance is critical* - achieved though:

- Protecting Independence
- Ensuring credibility — legitimate processes
- Adopting a conscious utilization focus
- Engaging broadly to promote transparency & accountability & ownership of results
Independence - Structural

Functions, and staff - organizationally independent from operations and policy units and decision making.

- **Executive Board**
  - Director reports to the Executive Board
    - (2 terms and no re-entry into UNDP)
  - Board approval of programme of work and budget
    - (independent of programme budget)

- **Reporting**
  - Evaluation reports are the responsibility of the Director
  - Transmitted directly to the Board following review and comment by management
  - Senior managers safeguard the independence: EO has access to all records and information
Independence - Behavioral

**Evaluators**
- Make independent decisions on scope, design, and data collection
- Abide by United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards, ethical guidelines, code of conduct
- Are not involved in programmatic decision-making and implementation

**Independence with engagement**
- Get content input and factual correction - views adequately considered – final decision is the EO

**Challenge**
- The complex nature of UNDP programmes require content, geographic, development and political understanding
- Of necessity, need to work with programme staff to understand programme theory and implementation
Credibility

Key Stakeholders: Executive Board; UNDP management and staff; Evaluation community; UN System and UN Evaluation Offices, governments; national and development partners

Credibility established via:

1. Quality of the Evaluation Function
   • Assessment by external peers [e.g. OECD DAC Peer Review of the UNDP Evaluation Office (2005)]

2. Quality of Evaluators
   • Recruitment based on UNEG Competencies for Evaluators

3. Quality of Evaluations
   • EO “Expert Panels” advise and validate work.
   • Methodological guides developed and used
   • Completed Evaluations used to engage with on evaluation platforms (professional associations and bodies)
   • Engagement of stakeholders and content experts
   • Use of Reference Groups (Internal UNDP and Country)
   • Tracking of implementation of recommendations
Indicators of credibility

Internal Credibility

- Use evaluations as one primary means for accountability

External Reviews of EO

- OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation
  (Peer Review of the UNDP Evaluation Office, December 2005)
- External review of the 2006 UNDP Evaluation Policy and its implementation
  (Independent review of UNDP Evaluation Policy, 2010)
- CIDA meta evaluations of EO evaluations and use in its evaluation of UNDP
  (Development Effectiveness Review of the United nations Development Programme 2005-2011, CIDA, April 2012.)

Bilateral use and coordination

- NORAD use EO evaluations with its parliament
- Recent collaboration with UK Independent Commission of Aid Impact (ICAI) in evaluation on electoral assistance
Utility

1. Supporting accountability and learning

1.1. Corporate Requirements
- Presentations of evaluations made to UNDP management and the Executive Board

1.2. Building the learning culture
- EO holds regular meetings on “lessons learned” from evaluations with senior management

1.3. Country level use
- ADR Stakeholder meetings (Illustration next page)

2. Management of evaluation
- Consultations with stakeholders and seek local ownership
- Timing of evaluations: ADRs accompany Country Programme Document (CPD) to the Board.

3. EO Knowledge management strategy and global outreach
- Increased engagement with external professionals in knowledge sharing, exchange, and innovation

Uptake:

Annual report on Evaluation
- In 2011 Board required management response to the ARE and key lessons and tracking of response.

Decentralized Evaluations
- Dedicated funds set aside for decentralized outcome evaluation
- Management response institutionalized for all evaluations and systematic follow-up
- Evaluation Family Force
Remarks of Mr. Amara Konneh, Minister for Finance, the Guest of Honor at the Stakeholder Validation Workshop for the Assessment of Development Report (ADR)

May 2, 2012

Fellow Members of Cabinet, Members of the Legislature here present; Members of the Judiciary here present; the Resident Coordinator; the Director of the Evaluations Office, New York; the UNDP Country Director, Heads of UN Agencies; our development partners

"......... After today’s validation, the Government of Liberia and the UNDP will have joint ownership of the ADR. Therefore, beyond today’s validation, it is our intent, as the Government, that together with the UNDP, we will make the ADR a living document. It will be consistently referred to in both ongoing and future dialogues with the UNDP, and will set the basis of our expectations for the quality of UNDP supported programs over the next five years. We will, therefore, expect the UNDP to make a significant departure from the way in which it has done business over the last nine years."
Transparency

- Defined in UNEG norms and standards

- Consultations with Stakeholders
  - TORS > Inception Report on Scope, Design and plan for data collection and analysis > Stakeholder Meetings > Draft Reports
  - The Audit Trail <> significance for mutual understanding and final decisions by EO

- Public Access
  - All UNDP plans and evaluations in the Evaluation Resource Center (ER)
  - EO evaluations in the EO website http://web.undp.org/evaluation/
  - Management response and tracking system (ERC)
  - Ratings on quality of decentralized evaluations
4. Evaluation scope and type

- **Purpose of Evaluation – Governance for Development Effectiveness**
  - Accountability
  - Learning and improvement
  - Knowledge and global lessons

**EO Types of Evaluation**
- Thematic Evaluations
  - Country level evaluations or Assessment of Development Results (ADRs)
- Programmatic Evaluations
  - Global and Regional Programmes
  - Special GA mandates - South South Cooperation
  - Strategic plan
Contribution to Development Results: Qualitative and Inductive Analytical Framework

1. Linkage with national development priorities and results (Descriptive and analytical)
   - UNDP strategic response, interventions, partnership strategy

2. Assessment of UNDP performance and added value (judgment in relation to specific evaluation criteria, sub-criteria or question)
   - Factors affecting UNDP performance

3. Assessment of External or Rival influences (cannot control but can account for them)
   - National contextual factors that affect outcomes

4. Contribution of UNDP – Inductive Analysis and Judgment
   - Exploration of broader characteristics of the programme and the causes for reaching the assessments
Thematic Evaluations

- Complex and no programmatic framework
- Scope beyond an individual country or region
- Global significance
- Policies, focus areas, cross-cutting themes, partnerships, cooperation modalities, business models, UN system-wide performance, UNDP strategic plan
- 24 evaluations between 2003 and 2012 (See Brochure)

**Evaluation of Poverty Environment Nexus:**
Re-organization of Bureau of Development Policy for more integrated approach and cross practice work.

**UNDP Contribution to Strengthening Local Governance:** Issue of "Scaling up" for outreach to larger population and increased sustainability - UNDP developed a series of practice notes - integrated into design of programmes

**UNDP Contribution to strengthening national capacities:** Use of systems dynamic as framework for development support and a focus on long-term issues of capacity development in programme design.
Regional Programme Evaluation

- **Programme components:**
  - Address common issue across multiple countries
  - Address cross-border issues
  - Produce Regional Human Development Reports
  - Provide advisory and training services to Country Offices
  - Establish Regional knowledge network, services, exchange
  - Define strategic position in the region

- **Management:**
  - Regional Bureaux — RBA RBEC RPAP, RPAS, RBLAC
  - Implementation through Regional Service Centers
Country Programme Evaluation
(Assessment of Development Results – ADRs)

ADR Process

- Preparatory mission/ToR
- Inception phase – final design + team orientation
- Data collection
- Analysis and feedback
- Report writing and review
- Stakeholder workshop
- Communication / dissemination > USE

ADRs were conducted in 59 countries

Countries Covered by ADR (2002–2011)
Assessment of Development Results (ADRs)

Scope

- UNDP country programme cycle of 4 years – ADR cover one or two cycles
- EO work programme between 5 and 15 ADRs annually
- Linked to preparation of new country programme

Strengths

- Comprehensive coverage of country programme
- Outcomes assessed in relation to national defined priorities
- A strategic tool for UNDP transparency and for strengthening partnerships at country level
- Foster evaluation culture and accountability in Country Office and in country
- Programme country Board members get engaged

Challenges

- Evaluability of programmes
- Complex programme and context (methodological challenges)
- National ownership and capacity development – important but takes time
- Vulnerable to sudden changes in the country context
- Difficulties when Country Office fail to safeguard independence
Other EO Mandated Activities: Standard Setting, Capacity development, Partnerships, Knowledge Management

**UNDP:** Support to decentralized evaluation function and products

- Setting standards; Guides; Assessment of evaluation quality

**United Nations Evaluation Group:** Coherence in UN system-wide evaluation

- Norms and standards; Guidelines; Methodology; Peer Reviews; UNEG Secretariat. ([www.unevaluation.org](http://www.unevaluation.org))

**Professional Networks:** Advancing Development Evaluation

- Regional: AfrEA, RELAC, Malaysia Eval Society, IPEN
- International: NONIE; ECG; IDEAS; IOCE; Eval Partners
4. Other EO Mandated Activities

1. Quality Assessment of Decentralized Evaluations
   - Assessment of the quality of evaluations conducted by programme units

2. National Evaluation Capacity
   - Promoting discussions on the need for improved national evaluation capacities – the NEC Conferences (2010, Morocco; 2011, South Africa, 2013, Brazil).
   - Promotes national ownership of results through partnerships and joint evaluations
5. Moving Forward – 2012 and beyond: Renewal for Global Relevance and Excellence

Global Visibility, Credibility, Partnerships, and Engagement

Transparency and systematization of EO operations:

- Codification of EO operations through an EO Manual

Knowledge management and increased sharing of evaluations

- EO proactively engaging with evaluation and other professional forums

Enhance ‘Cognitive Diversity’ and External Credibility

- Mechanisms to enhance diversity - composition of evaluators and teams to be improved
- Use of “Quality Assurance Panels”
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