

Draft 2019 Evaluation Policy

Marco Segone
Director, Evaluation Office



Evaluation Office

Key highlights

- Requested by Board and External review of evaluation function
- Update with adjustments and enhancements, NOT a rewriting
- Aligns with internal strategic frameworks, including the current **UNFPA Strategic Plan**, as well as global instruments, including the **2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, ICPD and UN reform**;
- Enhanced emphasis on a) UN coherence in evaluation and b) partnership for national evaluation capacity development
- Addresses structural challenges re: 3 KPIs lagging behind

Revised policy should address the three underperforming KPIs

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Overall assessment
Key performance indicator	Description						
Financial resources invested in evaluation function	Budget for evaluation as a percentage of total UNFPA programme budget	--	.45	.69	.91	.83	Overall positive trend, but far from reaching target of 3%
Human resources for monitoring and evaluation	Offices staffed with a monitoring and evaluation focal point or officer	100.0	100.0	95.9	99.2	96.7	Overall stable trend, closed to totality of COs with M&E staff
Evaluation coverage	Percentage of country offices that have conducted a country programme evaluation once every two cycles	--	--	--	--	80.0	Improvement needed
Evaluation implementation rate	Percentage of planned evaluations being implemented	--	--	--	60.0	55.0	Improvement needed
Quality of evaluations	Percentage of evaluations rated "good" and above	--	50.0	77.0	92.0	95.0	Positive trend
Evaluation reports posted on Evaluation Database	Percentage of completed evaluation reports posted on Evaluation Database	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	Achieved
Management response submission	Percentage of completed evaluation reports submitted with management response	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	Achieved
Implementation of management response	Percentage of management response actions completed	61.0	76.5	78.0	78.5	84.4	Positive trend

Summary of revisions

CHAPTER	NEW / UPDATED
I. Overview	Updated
II. Definitions	Updated
III. Principles and Norms	Updated
IV. Roles and Responsibilities	Updated
V. Evaluation Procedures	New
VI. Quality Assurance and Assessment	Updated
VII. Enhancing the Use of Evaluation	Updated
VIII. System-wide Evaluation and Partnerships	New
IX. National Evaluation Capacity Development	New
X. Resources	Updated
XI. Implementation, Reporting and Review	Updated

I. Overview

Purpose and scope of the policy

- Provides up-to-date definitions, principles, and norms and standards on evaluation
- Clarifies roles and responsibilities for the evaluation function

Rationale for revision

- Describes changing operational landscape and the need to reflect current global accords framing the work of evaluation, e.g. 2030 Agenda, disaster risk reduction (Sendai Framework), climate change (Paris Agreement), financing for development (Addis Ababa Action Agenda)

External strategic review of evaluation function

- References the review giving impetus to the current policy revision, in particular, suggestions to align with internal strategic frameworks (Strategic Plan) and global instruments (2030 Agenda, UN Charter and humanitarian principles, among others)

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

II. Definitions

Purpose of evaluation at UNFPA

- Emphasizes evaluation serves to demonstrate accountability, support evidence based decision making and contribute to lessons learned on how to accelerate implementation of ICPD.
- Aligns definitions with UNEG and **UNFPA oversight policy** (DP/FP/2015/2)

Types of evaluation at UNFPA

- **Distinguishes between centralized and decentralized evaluations**
- **States full commitment to joint and system-wide evaluations**
- Outlines criteria to guide selection of evaluations at both centralized and decentralized level, e.g. strategic relevance, potential to collaborate, risk, feasibility, knowledge gap, etc.

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

III. Principles and Norms

Principles of evaluation

- Emphasizes principles emanate from decisions taken by GA, UNFPA EB and EC, and UNEG
- Includes prevailing principles: national ownership; universally shared values of equity, justice, gender equality and respect for diversity; evaluation as integral to organizational standards of UNFPA; evaluation as part of a broader culture of accountability and managing for results.
- Updated to include principle on harmonizing and aligning evaluations with evaluation efforts of UN system partners

UNEG Standards and Norms

- Adheres to previous norms and standards: Utility; Credibility; Independence; Impartiality; Ethics; and Transparency.
- Updated to included added UNEG norms (2016): Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets; Human rights and gender equality; National evaluation capacities, and Professionalism.

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

IV. Roles and Responsibilities

- **Executive Board:** custodian of the evaluation policy and draws on recommendations of evaluations for its oversight and approval of UNFPA policies, strategies and programmes.
- **Executive Director:** principal champion of evaluation in UNFPA, safeguarding the independence of the office; provides the political support and enabling environment (incl. sufficient resources) for the office to fulfill its role and to enhance the overall evaluation culture in UNFPA; **in consultation with the Board**, appoints the Director of evaluation
- **Executive Committee:** considers and provides inputs to quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan, monitors follow-up to evaluation recommendations, and uses evaluation findings to inform decision making.
- **Oversight Advisory Committee:** advise the Executive Director in fulfilling the Executive Director's responsibilities for evaluation function.

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

IV. Roles and Responsibilities (2)

- **Evaluation Office:** is the custodian of the evaluation function, reporting **functionally to the EB** and administratively to the ED. It has the authority to determine the scope, design, conduct and commission of evaluations, and to submit reports directly to decision makers, including the EB.
- **UNFPA Programme Division:** coordinates management response of corporate evaluations to be prepared by relevant units. Monitors and reports on follow-up action to evaluations to ensure recommendations are implemented.
- **Senior Management:** promotes use of evaluation results in decision making, ensures adequate resources are available to support evaluations, and creates an enabling environment to strengthen evaluation culture. They are also responsible for managing decentralized programme level evaluations.
- **Regional M&E Advisors:** lead implementation of regional programme and/or thematic evaluations; provide technical support and quality assurance to country offices on evaluations; provides UNFPA inputs into regional inter-agency evaluation mechanisms.

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

V. Evaluation Procedures (New)

Evaluation Planning

- Outlines evaluation plans to strategically plan for evaluations, i.e. Quadrennial Budget Evaluation Plan, Regional Costed Evaluation Plans, Country Costed Evaluation Plans

Evaluation Coverage

- Emphasizes new Country Programmes have to be informed by adequate body of evaluations, and at least one CPE every two programme-cycle

Management and Conduct of Evaluations

- Stresses management arrangements are impartial and evaluation teams should be recruited via a open and transparent process
- Terms of Reference should reflect transparency and engagement; including the engagement of marginalized groups, and as appropriate young people/evaluators

VI. Quality Assurance and Assessment

- Updated as a stand-alone section (previously with capacity development and resources)
- Updated to clarify differences between quality assurance and assessment processes
 - **Quality Assurance** takes place during the evaluation process
 - **Quality Assessment** takes place after an evaluation is completed (ex post) whereby the final evaluation report is assessed by an external assessor

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

VII. Enhancing the use of Evaluation

- Updated as a stand-alone section (previously with implementation and reporting)
- Updated to elaborate on opportunities to enhance evaluation use and modalities to promote knowledge sharing and institutional learning, such as:
 - Linking decentralized evaluations to country programme and UNDAF cycles
 - Linking centralized evaluations to UNFPA planning and budgeting cycle, and mechanisms established to review progress toward SDGs
 - Purposefully selecting the type of evaluation for the needs at hand
 - Developing effective communication and dissemination plans for evaluation results

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

VIII. System-wide Evaluation and Partnerships (New)

- Welcomes the United Nations Secretary-General's report on repositioning the UN system to deliver on the 2030 Agenda and to step up joint efforts
- Reaffirms commitment to enhanced coherence and collaboration of UNFPA EO with other UN entities, through:
 - Joint evaluations
 - System-wide evaluations
 - UNEG network initiatives
 - Partnerships to strengthen national capacities to evaluate SDGs
- Re-confirms pledge to improve UNFPA performance against key indicators of UN-SWAP

IX. National Evaluation Capacity Development (New)

- Affirms UNFPA evaluations will be planned and conducted in partnership with national authorities, where possible
- Asserts that UNFPA will continue its efforts to:
 - Strengthen national evaluation systems;
 - Support evaluations toward achievement of SDGs (esp. related to UNFPA mandate);
 - Support generation of evidence to inform national processes and reports on progress toward the achievement of SDGs and ICPD goals;
 - Advocate for country-led evaluations and use of evidence from such evaluations.

X. Resources

Human Resources

- Provides instruction for Country Offices to establish adequate capacity for evaluation management; this includes a dedicated M&E specialist post or **multi-country M&E post** (e.g. smaller programmes). Otherwise, a M&E focal point should be nominated.
- Reaffirms that Regional Offices will have at least one P-5 level staff member dedicated to M&E activities

Financial Resources

- States that the ceiling to be allocated to the evaluation function should be up to **1.4 percent** of its overall programme expenditure, and up to **1.6 per cent subject to additional other resources mobilized**
- States that UNFPA will allocate funds for the EO and centralized elevations using a separated budget line in UNFPA integrated budget
- Explains that programmes that are funded by other resources rather than regular resources will use other resource funds for evaluation within their programme budgets
- **Confirms evaluation resource allocation for Country Offices are based on Country Costed Evaluations Plan; and that the Executive Director will establish a mechanism to ring-fence funds to support conducting and managing evaluations in small country offices**

Black color: existing text in the current Evaluation Policy

Red color: proposed revised or new text

Investments in Evaluation Function Across UN Agencies

Organization	Total Expenditure	Policy Guidance	Investments in Evaluation	Actual Percent
UNESCO	253 USD million	3%	USD 1.95 million	0.84%
UN WOMEN	340 USD million	3%	USD 7.39	2.9%
UNFPA	922 USD million	3% (proposed 1.7%)	USD 6.95 million	0.91%
UNDP	4,660 USD million	1%	USD 19.8 million	0.44%
UNICEF	5,450 USD million	1%	USD 50.1 million	0.8%
WFP	5,367 USD million	0.8%	USD 9 million	0.16%

Proposed revised ceiling

- Estimation with the assumption the total programme expenditure will remain stable from 2019-2023
- **A range from 1.4% (funded by RR and OR)...**
 - strengthen COs capacities to manage decentralized evaluations as by evaluation policy:
 - The design of new Country Programmes must be informed by an adequate and relevant body of evaluations, including CPE every two cycles
 - +25% COs with M&E specialists (including clustering COs at sub-regional level)
- **... to 1.6% (subject to additional OR raised):**
 - strengthen COs, ROs and EO to manage/support decentralized evaluations:
 - New P3 M&E specialists in 6 ROs
 - 'Regularization' of a P4 and 1.5 P2 in EO mainly dedicated to evaluation capacity development