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Mister President

I make this statement on behalf of Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Moldova, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, the United Kingdom, the United States, New Zealand and my own country, Switzerland.

We thank Executive Director Kanem and the Director of the UNFPA Evaluation Office for presenting the renewed UNFPA Evaluation Policy.

Let me start by praising UNFPA’s senior management's continued commitment to a strong evaluation function and the Evaluation Office for its agility and adaptiveness, enabling a steady progress despite a rapidly shifting and challenging context.

The renewal of the UNFPA evaluation policy came at the right time to reflect on necessary adjustments to the evaluation function, in particular for humanitarian and decentralized evaluations, and its funding requirements. We commend the Evaluation Office for commissioning a valuable independent peer review and for the extensive consultation process for the renewal of the evaluation policy. And we congratulate the Evaluation Office for drafting a sound and comprehensive evaluation policy, which will further strengthen the independence, relevance, quality and utility of UNFPA’s centralized and decentralized evaluations.

We support the proposed key changes in the renewed evaluation policy, such as rebranding the Evaluation Office to Independent Evaluation Office, the coordination with other oversight functions, in particular with the Office of Audit and Investigation Services, the adaptation of reporting lines for decentralized evaluations, as well as the
principle to cover all typologies of evaluations with this policy, including project evaluations and evaluations of humanitarian interventions.

Adequate, predictable and sustainable resourcing is key for a strong evaluation function. We appreciate the recalculated evaluation function funding target of 1% to 1.6% of UNFPA’s overall programme expenditure, being aligned with other UN agencies’ recently recalculated funding targets. And we also support the proposed phased approach towards an Evaluation Pooled Fund with the aim to – starting on a voluntary basis - increasingly secure funds for the evaluation function also through non-core funded (including humanitarian) programming.

In the consultation process on the evaluation policy we have however been told by UNFPA that further investments in evaluation human resources in the Country and Regional offices will only be possible once the Evaluation Pooled Fund is established and alimented. How does UNFPA intend to ensure the Country and Regional offices have the evaluation capacities needed to enhancing the relevance and quality of decentralized evaluations?

We thank Executive Director Kanem for informing the Executive Board Members - through the Executive Board Bureau - on the relocation of the Evaluation Office from New York to Nairobi as part of the UNFPA HQ optimization plan. We acknowledge the potential advantages for the evaluation function of being closer to some regional and country offices. However, we would be keen to hear the senior management’s assessment of eventual disruptive effects on the collaboration of the Evaluation Office with UNFPA’s senior management and the different organizational units as well as on the cooperation and coordination with other UN partners in New York, in particular those partners working on evaluation?

We would like to close by commending UNFPA for the renewed explicit commitment in the evaluation policy to continue engaging in System-wide, inter-agency and joint evaluations, including with the System-Wide Evaluation Office.

Thank you for your attention.