

Evaluation Office

**Annual Report
2010**

**UNICEF, New York
December 2010**

1. Executive Summary

The performance of the Evaluation Office (EO) remained strong in 2010 with notable progress towards the targets in the Office Management Plan in a majority of areas with a few gaps as follows.

Independent evaluation of UNICEF results by the EO. Programme Performance Assessments (PPAs) were completed for Turkey and Malaysia, and are under analysis for Costa Rica and Panama. An evaluability study of the Asia-Pacific Shared Service Center (APSSC) in Bangkok was also finalized.

The Evaluation of UNICEF's ECD Programme with focus on the Government of Netherlands funding for 2008-10 was completed. The evaluation included detailed evaluation case studies for Tanzania, Ghana, Cambodia and Nepal and a global survey component. The Evaluation of Life Skills Education Programme is well underway and the Evaluation of Community Management of Severe Malnutrition is in mobilization phase. Two PPAs and two programme evaluations were postponed due to capacity constraints in the EO and counterparts and reprioritization of the evaluation plan.

The humanitarian evaluation commitments for 2010, i.e., those surrounding the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT) Programme, were completed on schedule, as was a carry-over project from 2009 namely the Evaluation of UNICEF's Education Initiative in Timor-Leste. Other projects to be decided and planned in the third and fourth quarters of 2010 were not, however, as the HQ divisions originally proposing these evaluations were not yet ready to move forward. These included the thematic evaluation topic in EEPCT, to be decided together with the Education Section, and the UNICEF-specific RTEs and a gender-related evaluation, to be finalized together with EMOPS. It is worth noting that the progress made in the humanitarian portfolio in 2010 is proportionally greater than the OMP numerical target.

The 'Unite for Children, Unite Against AIDS' corporate evaluation was completed as scheduled. A corporate evaluation of UNICEF's Human Rights Based Approach to Programming is in the mobilization phase. A firm has been selected and work will begin in January 2011.

Support to major evaluations of UNICEF results by other Divisions/Offices in NYHQ and in the field. EO continued to play a key role in guiding and supporting evaluations managed by HQ Divisions as per the division specific needs and priorities. These included the Evaluation of the Child to Child Pilots; Evaluation of Community-based Catalytic Initiative (on-going); Effectiveness of Community-based ECD Centers; Corporate evaluation of the Adolescent Development and Participation Programme; Joint Impact of Evaluation of Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Programme in Mozambique with the Government of the Netherlands; and Evaluation of ECD Partnership. In addition, EO provided technical support in developing results and M&E framework for the UNGEI partnership;

EO also supported specific humanitarian-related evaluations at field level, to the South Sudan and Yemen Country Offices – in the former case in relation to its Evaluation of the Go-to-School Programme, and in the latter case the CO's RTE of the Saada Conflict.

Support to joint and inter-agency evaluations. EO plays a major role in managing the UNGEI Evaluation which has a global component and also examines country-level partnerships in Cote d'Ivoire; Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda and regional partnership in the Asia Pacific. Inter-agency collaborations constituted a large proportion of the humanitarian portfolio which included a Review of the Global Education Cluster Co-Leadership Arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children; Inter-agency real time Evaluation of the Pakistan Violence; Inter-agency RTE of the Earthquake in Haiti; A Survey of the affected population in Haiti; Evaluation of the Common Humanitarian Fund; and the Evaluation of the Central Emergency response Fund.

Contribution to knowledge creation and dissemination. All completed evaluations were disseminated in a systematic manner. To enhance the publication process, EO workflow process from report completion to publication and dissemination was reviewed and further strengthened. EO contributed to the mapping of national evaluation capacity development effort in collaboration with the ROs and disseminated its results through various network meetings.

EO continued to position itself as a knowledge centre on country-led M&E systems. EO and IOCE launched MyM&E, a web platform to share knowledge on country-led M&E system worldwide. Since its launch in May 2010, 22,000 visitors from 33 countries have visited this resource for various purposes. In addition, 2 series of live webinars were introduced in partnership with various partners and 9 webinars were organised. A Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) was designed which makes it possible to undertake quality assessment of all completed evaluation reports from last year. This is reported as an innovation.

Systemic leadership by the EO of UNICEF's evaluation function. The EO issued new guidance on prioritization of major evaluations and also designed and implemented the Global Evaluation Response Tracking System. EO continued to manage a Help Desk function able to address, in real-time, queries from Cos, ROs and HQ Divisions. To complement the Help Desk, a Global Evaluation Community of Practice (CoP) has been developed and launched – the biggest within UNICEF – uniting 360+ UNICEF professionals worldwide, enhancing personal and professional growth through the collective wisdom of peers, by sharing good practices, lessons learned, and finding answers to M&E challenges, and discussing emerging topics and trends in M&E.

Enhancing national ownership and leadership in evaluation. The EO developed the conceptual framework on National Evaluation Capacity Development, in line with the UNEG paper on the same topic. EO supported regionally-led initiatives on National Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia, CEECIS and Latin America. UNICEF also continued to support professional evaluation associations worldwide and trained Government staff in several countries.

As Co-Chair of the UNEG task force on Country-led Evaluation of Delivering as One (DaO), the EO played a lead role in supporting quality assurance of the DaO evaluations in Vietnam, Tanzania, Rwanda, Albania, Mozambique and Cape Verde.

Contribution to harmonization and systematization of evaluation norms, standards and approaches in the UN system. The EO continued to engage constructively with UNEG to strengthen the evaluation function by assuming leadership and supportive roles in various UNEG initiatives. As co-Chair of the EPE task force, the EO has played a lead role in organizing the 2010 evaluation practice exchange (EPE) seminar prepared as part of the UNEG annual general meeting. EO is also co-leading the UNEG task force on national capacity development and harmonization of evaluation; and is co-leading a UNEG task force to develop a concept paper on possible roles for UNEG and UN agencies in evaluation capacity development.

2010 witnessed a reassertion of UNICEF's leadership in the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP). The EO was invited by ALNAP to represent the UN system (along with OCHA) on the ALNAP Steering Committee and has also been asked to serve on a small Advisory Group to help develop a forthcoming Handbook on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action.

2. EO Targets and Strategies

The targets, expected results, and key performance indicators are presented in the matrix attached to this narrative report. A summary of 2010 results areas follows:

Independent evaluation of UNICEF results by the EO targets and strategies were specified for Programme Performance Assessments (PPAs); Programmatic Evaluations; Humanitarian Evaluations; and Institutional Effectiveness Evaluations.

Support to major evaluations of UNICEF results by other Divisions/Offices in NYHQ and in the field targets and strategies were specified for Support to major evaluations at HQ level; Preparing approaches to evaluating large areas of programming work; and Support to major humanitarian evaluations at field level.

Support to joint and inter-agency evaluations targets and strategies were specified for Joint and inter-agency evaluations related to development effectiveness; and Joint and inter-agency evaluations related to humanitarian action.

Contribution to knowledge creation and dissemination targets and strategies were specified for the Dissemination of evaluation reports of the EO; Support to lessons learned; Evaluation on the Web; and Administration of Evaluation and Research Database.

Systemic leadership by the EO of UNICEF's evaluation function targets and strategies were specified for evaluation policy and guidance; Report on the evaluation function and major evaluations; and Leadership to strengthen evaluation function across the organization.

Enhancing national ownership and leadership in evaluation targets and strategies were specified for Support to Regional and Country Offices in national evaluation capacity development efforts; and Country-level evaluations (country-led and other country-level and strategic evaluations).

Contribution to harmonization and systematization of evaluation norms, standards and approaches in the UN system targets and strategies were specified for Evaluation quality enhancement (UNEG); UNSSC/UNEG staff training programme; and Impact evaluation (UNEG/NONIE).

The main strategies remain consistent from year to year, and can be summarized this way:

- Identifying which evaluations must be managed independently and then managing them for UNICEF while ensuring a level of rigor and credibility that will pass critical peer review;
- Supporting other units as they conduct evaluations for learning purposes where independence is not an issue. Similarly, supporting other units in a range of evaluation relevant issues like operational research, interacting with partners on M&E issues, and obtaining management support.
- Devising and implementing ways to improve the performance of the 130+ professionals in UNICEF with Evaluation in the job title through guidance and policy development, capacity strengthening initiatives, and networking/knowledge management efforts.
- Interacting with the UN Evaluation Group to share good practices, develop cooperative norms, and present a united voice on global themes.

3. Analysis of Results and Strategies

Function 1: Independent evaluation of UNICEF results by the EO

Result 1A: Programme Performance Assessments (PPAs)

Analysis of main results achieved: In 2010 four Programme Performance Assessments (PPAs) of UNICEF Country Offices in middle-income countries were planned as well as a synthesis report. Two PPA reports were finalized, for Turkey and Malaysia. Field work for both was conducted in 2009. The Turkey PPA findings were presented at a CEE/CIS meeting in January 2010. Field work for the Costa Rica PPA was conducted in April. Preliminary findings were made but the report has not been finalized. A synthesis report of PPA findings in Middle Income Countries was incomplete at end 2010 and will be delivered in early 2011.

The EO also conducted a **review of the PPA pilot** with around 40 interviews with senior management at HQ, RO and CO levels. The review was conducted jointly with the Office of Internal Audit and the results reported to the management of the two offices. In part due to this review, an agreement was reached to discontinue the joint EO-OIA team managing the PPAs and for each unit to mainstream their PPA responsibilities in their ongoing work.

The **evaluability study of the APSSC in Bangkok** was planned and finalised. The APSSC evaluability study entailed a comprehensive assessment of the design and function of the technical assistance function in UNICEF comprising assessment of the respective roles and responsibilities of regional, country office and HQ players. The process allowed for a comprehensive management response process. The report was presented to the senior management reference group and at the Evaluation Committee meeting and management response from HQ and the regions was integrated. It was eventually decided by senior management to initiate a reconfiguration of the provision of technical assistance function in the Asia-Pacific region in new form and to capitalize on the important lessons learned from the experiment.

Shortfalls/constraints: Two planned PPPs were not completed due to prioritization of other tasks (the APSSC review). The dissolution of the working partnership with OIA was a result of dissimilar ways of exploring performance issues. While other OIA-EO partnering can be envisioned, on this issue it is better that the offices work independently.

Result 1B: Programmatic Evaluations

Analysis of main results achieved: 5 evaluations were planned. The following results were achieved.

The **Evaluation of UNICEF ECD Programme (focus on 2008-10 Government of Netherlands funding)** is near completion with case study reports for Nepal, Cambodia, Tanzania and Ghana finalized and the global synthesis report in draft stage. This evaluation is the first ever attempt to examine UNICEF's ECD programming with focus on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the global (MTSP) and country-level ECD programme strategies and cross-cutting issues including reaching less reached children. The evaluation conducted by an international team with the support of national consultants in the 4 case study countries provides lessons and recommendations for further strengthening ECD programmes and policies at the country level and globally.

The **Evaluation of Life Skills Education (LSE) Programmes** aims to assess UNICEF's support in establishing sustainable evidence-based life skills education programmes. The evaluation team commenced the review of curriculum-based LSE programmes offered in-school on a formalized basis, as well as an assessment in a sample of countries, of where programmes are with respect to accepted knowledge about successful programming practices in life skills education. This evaluation is underway. The evaluation team has already submitted an inception report, and the final evaluation report is expected in June 2011.

The **Evaluation of the Community-based Management of Severe Acute Malnutrition (CMAM)** saw limited progress due partly to the emergency programme priorities of key counterparts which delayed

necessary consultation required for timely implementation of the evaluation. The implementation of the evaluation is to commence in early 2011 as the TORs are agreed and expression of interest process has been completed.

Shortfalls/constraints: Out of the 5 evaluations planned under this component, one (Impact of Social Transfers on Child Protection) was cancelled and another one (Evaluation on aspects of Violence Programming) was postponed in consultation with Child Protection Section. The reason for cancelling the first one related to the infeasibility of conducting a global evaluation on a topic where UNICEF has very limited involvement. The reason for postponing the second one was due to the need to better synchronise it with its MTSP IMEF timing.

Shortfalls/constraints:

Result 1C: Humanitarian Evaluations

Analysis of main results achieved: The major humanitarian evaluation commitments slated for 2010, i.e., those surrounding the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (EEPCT) Programme, were completed on schedule, as was a carry-over project from 2009 (i.e., the Evaluation of UNICEF's Education Initiative in Timor-Leste). Other projects to be decided and planned in the third and fourth quarters of 2010 were not, however, as the HQ divisions originally proposing these evaluations were not yet ready to move forward. These included the thematic evaluation topic in EEPCT, to be decided together with the Education Section, and the UNICEF-specific Real Time Evaluations (RTEs) and a gender-related evaluation, to be finalized together with EMOPS. (See *Shortfalls/Constraints* below.)

At this point, OMP achievements are ahead of schedule: 6 of the 8 scheduled for the biennium were already completed in 2010, with 1 further exercise commencing in 2010 slated for completion in early 2011. Specific results achieved in humanitarian evaluation in 2010 include the following:

The Programme Review and Evaluability Study (PRES) of the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition Programme (EEPCT), which aimed to take stock of the programme and guide the approach and methods of the proceeding Progress Evaluation of the Programme was completed. The study included case studies for Kenya, Nepal and South Sudan. The recommendations of the study received a full management response by the Education Section. The PRES and its management response were presented by the EO and discussed at the Annual Review Meeting between UNICEF and donors in September 2010.

The second achievement of the portfolio is the **Progress Evaluation of the EEPCT Programme**, which began in May 2010. Columbia Group for Children in Adversity was selected to carry out the evaluation. The evaluation examined global level progress and covered six country case studies, including Angola, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia, Philippines, and Sri Lanka. Recommendations were found to be useful and well-received by Education Section and donors. The Global Report has been completed in December 2010, and the six case studies will be finalized in early 2011 to be disseminated and followed with a management response.

The third achievement was the completion of phase one of the **Education and Peacebuilding Research Project**. This research project is part of a wider documentation effort undertaken by the UNICEF EO, towards the achievement of Goal Three and Four of the EEPCT. The project will occur in two phases. Phase I (June-Dec 2010) was completed on schedule and is a desk-based review of documents in order to inform the methodology, scope and approach for Phase two, which will entail field research in six conflict-affected countries. Case Studies countries include Lebanon, Liberia, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Burundi. During the last informal presentation on Peacebuilding to the Executive Board, the project

was referred to as an important initiative to increase the evidence base in the area of peacebuilding that could better inform the Organisation's interventions in this area.

An **Evaluation of UNICEF's Education Initiative in Timor-Leste** that had begun in late-2009 was completed in 2010. This country-level evaluation, which the EO managed at the request of the main donor (SIDA), received positive feedback from the donor for its independence, breadth and depth of analysis of this multifaceted and complex programme in a short period of time, its systematic and large-scale consultation with the beneficiaries of the programme, and its cost-effectiveness. Its success was predicated upon close collaboration between the EO and Timor-Leste CO.

Finally, of the 5 management responses planned for the biennium, 1 is completed, 2 are in draft form undergoing interdivisional consultation and a fourth commenced. Completed management response was associated with the *Evaluation of UNICEF's Education Initiative in Timor-Leste*. Draft management response are ready for *Evaluation of Phase III: Investing in Humanitarian Action (2006-2009) of the DFID-UNICEF Programme of Cooperation*, and the *UNICEF Tsunami Evaluation (2004-2008)*. A management response emanating from the *Review of the Global Education Cluster Co-Leadership Arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children* (described below) commenced in 2010 and is expected to be completed in 2011.

Shortfalls/constraints: As noted above, some planning activities foreseen for the biennium have not yet been undertaken. The Education Section of PD has adjusted its Research and M&E portfolio to emphasize research more, and a decision is awaited on the planned *Thematic evaluations on UNICEF's Education in Emergencies (EiE) Programme*. Concerning the *Strengthening Gender Equality Programming in Humanitarian Action*, the EO was informed midyear that, after conducting a small-scale evaluability-type internal assessment of its work in this area, EMOPS wishes to postpone this exercise to a later date to be determined. A key constraint associated with this shortfall thus appears to be the lack of clarity within the Organization on accountabilities for following through on official evaluation commitments. Although one UNICEF-specific RTE was scheduled, the complexity of the external RTEs in Haiti and Pakistan consumed the entire RTE effort, as described later.

Constraints of a more systemic nature hampered the humanitarian evaluation portfolio in delivering on targeted results in an optimal way. First, resources for humanitarian evaluation within UNICEF have not kept pace with the Organization's level of humanitarian activity. Second, although the UNICEF Evaluation Policy states that the EO-led evaluations are to be independent, what this means in practice has yet to be articulated by way of clear, concrete instructions. As a result, threats to independence do emerge that have to be carefully negotiated, causing a time and energy penalty that could have been avoided.

Result 1D: Institutional Effectiveness Evaluations

Analysis of main results achieved: The **Unite for Children, Unite Against AIDS** corporate evaluation was completed as scheduled. It examined the relevance of the Campaign targets, management issues and partnership dynamics, and numerous other aspects. As the Unite campaign is not a conventional strategy or program, the evaluation employed methodologies developed to measure Advocacy processes and results. The evaluation was commissioned by the Unite management team that includes NatComs and others. After completion, a Management Response was completed and approved by the committee. The key response was a sharpening of the focus of the campaign towards two of the original four priorities as areas where quicker progress was possible and as where UNICEF and partners had a comparative advantage.

A corporate evaluation of **UNICEF's Human Rights Based Approach to Programming (HRBAP)** is in the mobilization phase. A firm has been selected and work will begin in January 2011.

Shortfalls/constraints: None beyond a delay in starting the HRBAP work due to competing time commitments for key EO and DPP staff.

Function 2: Support to major evaluations of UNICEF results by other Divisions/Offices in NYHQ and in the field

Result 2A: Support to major evaluations at HQ level

Analysis of main results achieved: Evaluation of Child-to-Child pilots: School readiness pilots in six countries (Bangladesh, China, DRC, Ethiopia, Tajikistan and Yemen) completed their second year of piloting in 2010, and will be entering the third and final year in 2011. Following the baseline evaluation at the inception of the pilots, a progress evaluation was conducted at the end of 2009, the results of which were reported in March 2010. The evaluation showed low but significant effect in learning achievement, and strong and significant results in on-time enrolment. Evidence from the evaluation was also used for comparative learning between piloting countries, and to effect improvements in the third year of piloting. A summative evaluation of the pilot is planned for the end of 2011.

Preparatory work in evaluating the community-based catalytic initiative in Health: EO has continued to play an advisory role in conceptualizing and planning an impact evaluation of the catalytic initiative. The evaluation is being organized by the Health Section, PD with the involvement of a team from Johns Hopkins University. In the 2010 review meeting, it was reported that utilisation of high impact services is a major constraint faced in improving coverage. This is likely to require an operational evaluation of community mobilization and demand aspects of the catalytic initiative.

Effectiveness of Community-based ECD Centers: Initial TOR were developed by the ECD Unit and reviewed by the EO. Recruitment of the evaluation team will commence in January 2011.

Adolescent Development and Participation (ADAP) corporate evaluation: This evaluation was completed as planned and a management response is being formulated. The findings confirmed the relevance of robust adolescent themed programming to UNICEF, and the multiple difficulties facing ADAP programming that follows from being a cross-cutting theme rather than a specific priority.

WASH Impact Evaluation: In a follow-up to the 2008 baseline survey stage, a joint EO-UNICEF WASH Section-Netherlands Evaluation Office (Foreign Ministry) team conducted a visit to Mozambique, the site of the One Million Initiative. The mission's primary purpose was to investigate whether structures for sustainability are being properly developed. This is fulfilling a commitment to have central EO presence in this large operational research effort.

Shortfalls/constraints: It is hard to find subject specialists who also have evaluation expertise. The firm conducting the ADAP evaluation had limited expertise about the development needs of and programming strategies for adolescence. Consequently, the findings over-concentrated on enabling factors such as leadership and resources rather than the equally important substantive issues.

Additional achievements: Evaluation of ECD Partnership: Although it was not part of EO's AWP, EO provided considerable support for conceptual development, TOR setting and continued quality assurance of this evaluation of ECD Partnership being managed by the ECD Unit. The inception phase has been completed and the report is due for completion in the first quarter of 2011. The evaluation will guide UNICEF's partnerships for ECD and may influence similar partnerships in other sectors.

Result 2B: Preparing approaches to evaluating large areas of programming work

Analysis of main results achieved: EO provided technical support in the development of a **results framework for the UNGEI partnership**. The monitoring and evaluation framework has undergone several iterations and the first phase of validation with a country level partnership. Further validation at the regional level and with the global partnership is underway as part of the global UNGEI evaluation. A validated framework will be disseminated in June 2011.

Shortfalls/constraints: None.

Result 2C: Support to major humanitarian evaluations at field level

Analysis of main results achieved: Within the humanitarian portfolio, EO had committed to facilitate a **workshop on real-time evaluation**. In 2010, based on foreseen demand, this commitment was expanded to include a *series* of webinars on humanitarian evaluation more generally – including guidance and support on evaluation of humanitarian advocacy, preparedness, transition and recovery as well as RTEs. The EO approached a number of potential moderators of these webinars in 2010, and in 2011 will more systematically assess field-based colleagues' learning needs in this area, with a view to launching the webinars later in 2011. Intended results include the enhancement of colleagues' understanding of and capacity for these facets of humanitarian evaluation.

Support was also provided to specific humanitarian-related evaluations at field level. The EO provided critical supports to the South Sudan and Yemen Country Offices – in the former case in relation to its **Evaluation of the Go-to-School Programme**, and in the latter case the CO's **RTE of the Saada Conflict**. These supports helped strengthen the technical merit of these evaluations.

Shortfalls/constraints: None

Function 3: Support to joint and inter-agency evaluations

Result 3A: Joint and inter-agency evaluations related to development effectiveness

Analysis of main results achieved: The **Evaluation of the United Nations Girls Education Initiative (UNGEI)** aims to define the key elements that make a strong partnership for girls' education; validate the UNGEI results framework; collect empirical baseline data against which future evaluative work and progress can be measured; and, map the governance structure and administrative components of the UNGEI partnership at the global level. The evaluation is underway in five country level partnerships (Cote d'Ivoire Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria Uganda) and the regional partnership in East Asia Pacific. The EO has a major role of day-to-day management of the evaluation on behalf of the UNGEI. The results of the evaluation are expected in June 2011.

Shortfalls/constraints: None.

Result 3B: Joint and inter-agency evaluations related to humanitarian action

Analysis of main results achieved: Inter-agency collaborations constituted a large proportion of the humanitarian portfolio in 2010. The EO spearheaded, and then jointly managed, a major Review of the Global Education Cluster Co-Leadership Arrangement together with a counterpart from Save the Children. It also took part in three IA-RTEs and IA-RTE-related exercises, as well as two other major inter-agency evaluations related to the funding of humanitarian action, both led by OCHA. Specific results achieved included the following:

A review of the **Review of the Global Education Cluster Co-Leadership Arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children** was completed. This review, which was called for in the MoU between the two parties establishing the co-leadership arrangement, was co-managed with an evaluation

counterpart at the Save the Children UK. It generated important information on how well the co-leadership arrangement is functioning, whether it has the necessary architecture and modes of working together in place to succeed and achieve the Global Cluster's objectives, and what benchmarks might be used to measure the arrangement's success in future. The review arguably helped strengthen a relationship that had undergone a period of less-than-optimal cooperation. These results were facilitated through an excellent partnership in co-managing the evaluation with Save the Children.

An inter-agency real-time evaluation undertaken during this period was the **IA-RTE of the Pakistan Violence**, managed by OCHA. UNICEF did not serve on the Management Group of this OCHA-led evaluation but instead supported it in the development of its TOR, recruitment of consultants, provision of financial support, access to UNICEF staff, and dissemination of evaluation outputs for comment.

UNICEF played a larger role in another IA-RTE, the **Inter-Agency Real-Time Evaluation of the Response to the January 2010 Earthquake in Haiti (Phase I)** which was successfully launched within 3 months of the emergency and delivered the main debriefing in early May. The EO was part of a three-member Management Group consisting of OCHA, the International Rescue Committee and UNICEF. Key results focused mainly on improvements in the process associated with the RTE modality, which remains under constant refinement owing to its unique challenges. (See *Shortfalls/constraints* above.) These results include the timeliness of the exercise – this IA-RTE marked the first to be launched by the three-month marker – as well as major improvements to the methodology used: in addition to standard evidence sources (i.e., interviews), UNICEF provided the evaluation team with valuable data collected remotely, thus minimizing the team's footprint on the ground in the midst of the emergency. These milestones were achieved in part owing to successful teamwork with the IRC.

The EO has also served on the Management Group associated with the second phase of this evaluation, the **Inter-Agency Real-Time Evaluation of the Response to the January 2010 Earthquake in Haiti (Phase II)**. The second phase, which was originally scheduled for autumn 2010 and intended to focus on recovery and transition, was postponed to early 2011 owing to the subsequent outbreak of cholera and the violence ensuing from this and the results of the 28 November election. The EO has spearheaded the effort to undertake consultations with colleagues on the Humanitarian Country Team to determine what if any value-added such an exercise would have.

A **Survey of the Affected Population in Haiti**, proposed to strengthen both IA-RTE methods as well as accountability to the affected population, was drafted in 2010. The survey will mark the first-ever national survey based on a representative sample of the affected population in a post-emergency. As such, the baselines it establishes will help track progress in meeting the population's needs over time, a focus of the Joint Humanitarian Impact Evaluation initiative described below.

A **UNICEF-focused Independent Review of UNICEF's Operational Response to the January 2010 Earthquake in Haiti**, commenced in mid-2010. This review, conducted at the request of the OED, is slated for completion in late February 2011. It is intended to help UNICEF enact significant changes in the way it prepares for and responds to emergencies.

On the **Five-Year Evaluation of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)**, early on the EO joined forces with WFP to advocate for stronger governance arrangements in order to strengthen the quality and independence of this evaluation. (OCHA, aside from managing the evaluation, also administers the CERF, leading to an unacceptable conflict of interest if not countered with strong evaluation governance.) In the case of the **Evaluation of the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF)**, the EO represented UNICEF on the evaluation advisory committee, providing critical feedback on conceptual clarity and all evaluation outputs and in consolidating the feedback of UNICEF colleagues from the 3 case study countries (Sudan, DRC, CAR) and NYHQ to be shared with OCHA and its evaluation team.

In addition, EO participated in the **Joint Humanitarian Impact Evaluation (JHIE)** initiative, spearheaded by OCHA by providing inputs in the draft concept note and moderated a series of focus groups with key stakeholders. This collaboration has helped elucidate stakeholders' understanding of and views on JHIE, and will provide a critical input into a planned piloting of JHIE in the months and years ahead. Toward this end, it is envisioned by these JHIE-interested stakeholders that the *Survey of the Affected Population in Haiti* will be a key input into a potential JHIE pilot in Haiti.

Shortfalls/constraints: The one shortfall in this area centred on the EO's inability to continue engaging on the Netherlands-led **Multi-donor Evaluation of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in Southern Sudan**, despite active engagement on the Steering Committee for this evaluation in the early stages of the exercise early in the year. The grounds for disengagement from this project underline the key of the portfolio as a whole: the lack of capacity to adequately meet all expectations with only one full-time senior staff member. Another constraint is the challenge of bringing UNICEF's perspective to bear on joint and inter-agency evaluations, most of which are led by OCHA, in order to ensure high quality and independence in these evaluations. UNICEF has had mixed success in strengthening these evaluations, in part owing to the EO's need to juggle these with its own UNICEF-specific evaluations, and in part owing to the inherent challenge of negotiating decision-making with inter-agency partners.

Function 4: Contribution to knowledge creation and dissemination

Note: The discussion of *Shortfalls/constraints* for all of function 4 follows the Result 4D discussion.

Result 4A: Dissemination of evaluation reports of the EO

Analysis of main results achieved: The evaluations completed this year and in the previous year were disseminated in a planned manner. To enhance the publication process of EO evaluation reports, a specific effort was carried out to produce a clear workflow process for EO publications. In addition, an EO publication plan was created, monitored and implemented.

Result 4B: Support to lessons learned

Analysis of main results achieved: Immediately after the release of the UNICEF framework on National Evaluation Capacity Development, EO, in partnership with ROs, facilitated the **mapping of National Evaluation Capacity Development** initiatives designed and implemented by ROs and COs. The EO/RO collaboration **identified selected countries with good practices, innovations, and lessons learned**, with the aim of documenting and sharing them. The results detail UNICEF's contribution to country-led M&E systems and are now available at the [In Practice](#) Intranet site and were presented at several technical meetings.

Result 4C: Evaluation on the Web

Analysis of main results achieved: The EO continued to position itself as a knowledge centre on country-led M&E systems. The vision is that UNICEF staff, partners and key stakeholders use the UNICEF-led and user-friendly **knowledge management (KM) system** to strengthen national evaluation capacity. With this aim, the EO and IOCE, in partnership with other stakeholders, designed and launched **MyM&E**, an interactive Web 2.0 platform to facilitate sharing of knowledge on country-led M&E systems worldwide. In addition to being a learning resource, My M&E facilitates the strengthening of a global evaluation community, while identifying good practices and lessons learned. Since its launch in May 2010, 21,904 visitors from 33 countries download 75,740 pages.

An integral part of MyM&E are **two series of live webinars** on emerging issues on development evaluation. In partnership with UNDP, WFP, UNIFEM ILO, IDEAS, IOCE and the Rockefeller

Foundation, 9 live webinars were organized on a range of topics. The webinars which involved international keynote speakers had the participation of 1,500 participants from all over the world.

Result 4D: Administration of Evaluation and Research Database

Analysis of main results achieved: A **Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS)** was designed in 2010 through which all completed evaluation reports from 2009 are being quality-assessed. It is expected that the GEROS will confirm the impact of quality-assurance mechanisms designed and implemented by COs and ROs. GEROS uses the UNEG evaluation reports standards as basis for review and assessment of final evaluation reports, while ensuring specific standards relevant to UNICEF are taken into consideration. To ensure credibility and effective reviews, the assessment of final evaluation reports is outsourced to an independent company. Please see additional information under the chapter “Innovation” of this report.

While the Global Evaluation Database contains evaluations, surveys, studies and researches, GEROS reviews only evaluation reports, prioritizing most recent reports and major evaluations. EO uploads reports assessed as of satisfactory quality in the UNICEF Internet webpage, and informs appropriate HQ Divisions/ROs of the satisfactory reports in their own area of work/regions. It also facilitates further processing of evaluation knowledge by such means as meta-analysis, and extrapolation of good practices and lessons learned.

Shortfalls/constraints for all of Function 4: Despite of the fact that in 2010 a clear workflow process for EO publications was developed, in addition to an EO publication plan, there is still room to ensure evaluation reports are published and disseminated in a timely manner. Evaluation managers still need to see the final phase of the evaluation process as an integral and strategic component to ensure evaluation findings are used to inform programs.

Function 5: Systemic leadership by the EO of UNICEF’s evaluation function

Note: The discussion of *Shortfalls/constraints* for all of function 5 follows the Result 5C discussion.

Result 5A: Evaluation policy and guidance

Analysis of main results achieved: To improve prioritization of evaluations in the organization, the EO developed and issued a new guidance note indicating how to determine the relevance of possible evaluation topics for UNICEF management and its partners. This should lead to greater ownership over the process of change, and ultimately, ensure accountability for results. Several ROs developed, in partnership with EO, regional evaluation mechanisms to ensure both the strategic selection and quality of evaluations commissioned by COs.

Following the issuance of the Guidance on Management Response to Evaluation in 2009, the EO designed and implemented the **Global Evaluation Response Tracking System**. Through the system, UNICEF Offices are able to give information on the overall response to evaluations issued by their own office, indicate whether management agrees or disagrees with the recommendations made by an evaluation, provide time-bound action plans and keep track of their implementation. Based on the information inputted by UNICEF offices in the Global tracking system, EO can now generate reports based on management response to a single evaluation, as well as by country, region or year to summarize the progress towards management response.

The Evaluation Policy and Executive Board Decisions request that UNICEF strengthens national capacities for country-led evaluation systems. EO developed a framework on [Developing National Capacities for Country-led Evaluation Systems](#), giving the rationale for engaging on national evaluation

capacity development, by a) reiterating why it is important to support country-led evaluation systems; b) presenting a systemic approach for the framework which covers both demand and supply sides, whilst strengthening an enabling environment, institutional and individual capacities; and c) offering options on what UNICEF and partners can do to support country-led evaluation systems. Based on the above framework, EO, in partnership with ROs, identified COs good practices and made them available to facilitate south/south learning.

In addition, EO contributed to the revision of the **PPP Manual** and **PPP Training** ensuring that the Evaluation Policy and related guidance developed in 2009 and 2010 were well reflected.

Result 5B: Report on the evaluation function and major evaluations

Analysis of main results achieved: The 2010 Report to the Executive Board was delivered at the Second Session in 9/10. It was accepted with positive comments and a supportive decision that emphasized, inter alia, the need for improved reporting on the function and further investments in national evaluation capacity building.

In order to prepare for the 2011 report, and for other uses, **a survey of the decentralized Evaluation function in UNICEF** is under preparation. It will be administered in 2011 by an independent firm to all country offices. Issues such as time allocation, sharing of M&E accountabilities, capacity strengthening needs, ethical practices, and independence will be surveyed.

Result 5C: Leadership to strengthen evaluation function across the organization

Analysis of main results achieved: In 2010 the EO continued to support the **roll-out and implementation of the Evaluation Policy** by participating in relevant sessions of strategic meetings, such as the Deputy Representative Meeting in WCARO, Regional M&E Workshops in Asia and CEECIS, as well as in regional webinars in MENAR and WCAR.

The EO continued managing a Help Desk function to be able to address, in real-time, queries from COs, ROs and HQ Divisions. To complement the Help Desk, a **Global Evaluation Community of Practice (CoP)** has been developed and launched. The CoP enhances personal and professional growth through the collective wisdom of peers, by sharing good practices and lessons learned, finding answers to M&E challenges, and discussing emerging topics and trends in M&E.

This CoP – the biggest within UNICEF - unites 360+ UNICEF professionals worldwide, reaching out to professionals beyond the evaluation arena. The Evaluation CoP was visited by 937 UNICEF staff in 2010. The top countries visiting the CoP in 2010 were: USA, Egypt, Senegal, Pakistan, Bhutan, Thailand, Burundi, Kenya, Colombia, and Jordan. In a survey conducted in December 2010, 99% of CoP users stated that the Evaluation CoP is meeting their needs for information and knowledge sharing (31% mentioned this was only partially). Ninety-four percent responded that time and/or workload is the main challenge they face in using/participating in the Community of Practice.

Borrowing from the experience of other sectors and from SMS colleagues, UNICEF (EO and Child Protection) and Save the Children organized a meeting with a large number of partners to define and contribute to a **Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (MERG) in Child Protection**. The group was officially formed in July, with UNICEF and Save the Children sharing the Chair duties for the first year. The MERG has defined an equal measure of M and E priorities, in contrast to most MERGs that focus much more on the M agenda.

The EO worked with the Vision implementation team to incorporate necessary functionality in Vision and the associated dashboards. While two desired attributes were not included (spending on Evaluation, the

CO level Integrated M&E Plans), the addition of a Means of Verification window with a pass through link to the CO Evaluation web pages, will permit real time quality assurance by HQ and ROs.

The Integrated M&E framework of the MTSP was revised and approved by the Board. Comments on this process are offered in the Management Section 5.

Significant efforts were made jointly with the Policy Section to develop a UNICEF toolkit on Advocacy programming. The EO sponsored a detailed **M&E companion toolkit** and has helped with the joint dissemination and training of the final products. A Help Desk and additional training are scheduled for 2011.

Additional achievements: The EO made a significant contribution to the development of an inter-agency resource pack on C4D research, monitoring and evaluation. This is a much needed resource to which EO will need to continue its contribution until it is finalized in 2011.

Shortfalls/constraints for all of Function 5: In 2010, EO achieved important results in terms of designing and making available to UNICEF staff and partners innovative and state-of-the-art Knowledge management systems in support of the evaluation function. However, these achievements may be hampered by an organizational culture that does not prioritize knowledge sharing among staff. In December 2010, a Client Satisfaction survey was conducted. Despite of the fact 99% of respondents stated that the Evaluation CoP is meeting their needs for information and knowledge sharing (31% mentioned this was only partially), 94% percent responded that time and/or workload is the main challenge they face in using/participating in the Community of Practice. As a more general issue, resource constraints force critical prioritization decisions within the many needs for systemic strengthening.

Function 6: Enhancing national ownership and leadership in evaluation

Note: The discussion of *Shortfalls/constraints* for all of function 6 follows the Result 6B discussion.

Result 6A: Support to Regional and Country Offices in national evaluation capacity development efforts

Analysis of main results achieved: The **conceptual framework on National Evaluation Capacity Development** developed by EO in line with the UNEG paper on the same topic, is a first attempt to guide UNICEF offices in enhancing national capacities for country-led evaluation systems. It is complemented by the [recent books](#) published by UNICEF in partnership with the World Bank and others including governmental representatives responsible for National Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In 2010, EO supported regionally-led initiatives on National Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia, CEE/CIS and Latin America. Extensive details may be found in the regional office reports. In summary: UNICEF, in partnership with key development partners, delivered assistance to 15 countries in enhancing national M&E frameworks; supported professional evaluation associations worldwide, including at regional level in Africa, CEE/CIS and Latin America, and national level in 8 countries; directly trained Government staff in at least 10 countries; strengthened the capacity of local centres of excellence to deliver high quality training in India and Bangladesh; and organized Regional Conferences on country-led M&E systems.

Result 6B: Country-level evaluations (country-led and other country-level and strategic evaluations)

Analysis of main results achieved: As Co-chair of the UNEG task force on **Country-led Evaluation of Delivering as One (DaO)**, the EO played a lead role in supporting quality assurance of the DaO evaluations in Vietnam, Tanzania, Rwanda, Albania, Mozambique and Cape Verde. This involved organising guidelines for the evaluation process and reviewing TORs, inception reports and draft reports. EO also participated in the Vietnam high-level meeting and contributed to its preparation by ensuring timely review of evaluation reports. The findings of the evaluation will feed into the independent evaluation of the DaO being which will be commissioned by the Secretary General in 2011.

Shortfalls/constraints for all of Function 6: EO invested major efforts in developing the UNICEF Conceptual Framework on national evaluation capacity development, and identifying good practices implemented by UNICEF offices all over the world in 2010. However, full realization of an NECD strategy depends on strong UNEG investment and cooperation. In addition to normal difficulties in agreeing on a joint priority, the severe resource constraints in other agencies make it very unlikely they can adopt this as a strong priority. UNICEF will have to carefully explain this to the Board and other interested parties.

Function 7: Contribution to harmonization and systematization of evaluation norms, standards and approaches in the UN system

Note: The discussion of *Shortfalls/constraints* for all of function 7 follows the Result 7C discussion.

Result 7A: Evaluation quality enhancement (UNEG)

Analysis of main results achieved: The EO continued to engage constructively with UNEG to strengthen evaluation function by assuming leadership and supportive roles in various UNEG initiatives. As co-Chair of the EPE task force, the EO has played a lead role in organizing the 2010 **evaluation practice exchange (EPE)** seminar prepared as part of the UNEG annual general meeting. EO staff presented two papers one on lessons learned from tsunami evaluation and the other on national capacity development.

EO is co-leading the UNEG task force on national capacity development and harmonization of evaluation. In addition, EO staff are members of the task force on impact evaluation, gender and human rights and Evaluation TOR and report quality standards. UNEG provides an important venue both to advocate for and influence UN wide evaluation function strengthening which is critical for fulfilling UNICEF's mandate.

The humanitarian portfolio, which lacks a clear forum within UNEG, finds its main inter-agency network on evaluation quality enhancement in the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP). Within this context, 2010 witnessed a reassertion of UNICEF's leadership in ALNAP, first by way of an invitation by ALNAP to represent the UN system (along with OCHA) on the **ALNAP Steering Committee**. Within ALNAP, the EO has also been asked to serve on a small Advisory Group to help develop a forthcoming **Handbook on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action**. Together, these areas of inter-agency participation have already yielded results, including a more quality- and independence-conscious counterbalance to OCHA's perspective, thereby enhancing the reputation of UNICEF and the UN on this multi-stakeholder organization.

Result 7B: UNSSC/UNEG staff training programme

Analysis of main results achieved: UNICEF has been co-leading a UNEG task force to develop a concept paper on possible roles for UNEG and UN agencies in national-level evaluation capacity development. The concept paper will be presented at the 2011 UNEG Annual General Meeting (AGM) and will thereafter inform UNEG work, as well as better coordination of UN agencies initiatives. In

addition, under the leadership of UNICEF and UNIFEM, the UNEG Evaluation training is under review and is being quality-assured. It will be made available on February 2011.

Result 7C: Impact evaluation (UNEG/NONIE)

Analysis of main results achieved: Through the UNEG task force on impact evaluation, EO has continued to promote the use of impact evaluation in the UN system and to the development of guidance on impact evaluation through the Network of the Network on Impact Evaluation (NONIE). In addition, the EO is contributing to the development of a guidance document on impact evaluation of normative standards and institutional support work which will be available by mid-2011. These resources are expected to strengthen impact evaluation of UNICEF supported programmes globally and to equip staff for promoting the use of impact evaluation in a systematic and informed manner.

Shortfalls/constraints for all of Function 7: The UNSSC/UNEG training program was thought ready for a major scale up in 2010. However, a lack of support from the Staff College due to resource problems, and a re-examination of the materials showed that more preparatory work was needed. In particular, the number of topics needs to be shortened to a critical few, and the instruction methods have to be adapted to distance and web-enabled learning. 2010 was thus converted to redesign rather than implementation.

4. Management and Operations

The EO had a full complement of staff throughout 2010, with a single exception. In general, the human resources were as projected. The exception was the departure at the end July of the Director. Board approval was sought to raise the post level to D-2. The approval was granted. The Director is expected to assume the Post in early 2011. One of the senior staff acted as Officer-In-Charge during the interregnum.

The larger management structures performed well. The Evaluation Committee met twice and exercised a strong voice in the work plan and in requesting information for future decisions. In particular, the Committee is seeking 2011 recommendations in two areas: a) resourcing the function, and b) ensuring proper levels of independence. One welcomed decision was the commitment to review and comment upon the corporate evaluation agenda embodied in the MTSP Integrated M&E Framework. The IMEF process to date (and in the 2010 interim review) depends on self-nomination of topics by sectors that have managed the work. This poses the potential biases of nominating more positive programming for evaluation, or neglecting less well working programs. It also leaves a void in identifying cross-cutting themes. A review by the Evaluation Committee will enable a more objective decision taking on items to include.

As has been described in earlier sections, a variety of mechanisms have been employed to better link the three levels of UNICEF M&E officers. Likewise, the joint efforts organized through the UN Evaluation Group were described in results 6B-7C and within the humanitarian sections. UNEG has proven a capable forum for joint development of norms and other common interests. It has not yet proven capable of addressing structural issues across the UN evaluation family, and cannot yet be relied upon as a management tool to address such issues.

In terms of partnerships, the private sector is really engaged only through competitive bidding for evaluation contracts. The problem is the inability to generate bids from Southern institutions due to the apparent complexity of the TORs. The EO is certain the South is being reached from the efforts to publicize widely. The main partnership frameworks outside the UN Evaluation Group are through professional associations that help national institutions and practitioners organize for training etc. While these are the object of much UNICEF support (see results 4C and 6A) there is not much evidence of improved quality or benefit to UNICEF's evaluation function. Positive results are expected from the newest sectoral M&E Reference Groups (MERGS), in Child Protection MERG (see result 5C). Major INGOs and bilaterals are cooperating to offer M&E support to the full sector. While not yet delivering technical products in 2010, the CP MERG is following the path set by many other MERGs that UNICEF participates in (HIV-AIDS, Mortality, Malaria, etc.)

Very positive joint efforts were organized by other divisions that the EO supported. Key items included the MOPAN process, a variety of bi-lateral meetings with donors, the entirety of the Change Management structures, the external audit process, and interaction with the Executive Board.

The EO consulted with Regional Offices about KPIs for the entire evaluation function. These recommendations have been included in the requests made to Vision and related planning/KM efforts. In particular, the dashboards visible to managers across the organization will reflect these KPI discussions.

There were no operational problems encountered in 2010. The Office maintained a regular spending pattern and in fact acquired significant new funds thanks to the Governments of Spain and Switzerland. Spain has asked for an unusual level of cooperation in the conduct of certain pieces of research and evaluation. UNICEF acceded subject to guarding independence properly. Actual joint activities will be discussed in 2011.

Several managerial aspects affecting emergency preparedness and response were noted earlier, in particular the Part 3 discussions of results 1C, 2C, and 3B.

The EO was relocated to 3 UN Plaza in December 2010. This welcome move will foster better working relationships with several divisions in 2011.

5. Innovations and Lessons Learned

Innovations

GEROS: The majority of evaluations supported by UNICEF are managed at the country level. While the decentralized nature of the evaluation function ensures that evidence generated is relevant to the local context and therefore more likely to inform national policies for children, it poses the challenge of setting up a consistent corporate system to ensure access to good quality and credible evaluations.

To address this concern, a Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) was designed and is being implemented with four main objectives, 1) provide senior managers with a clear and short independent assessment of the quality and usefulness of individual evaluation reports, including those commissioned by their own offices; 2) strengthen internal evaluation capacity by providing to commissioning offices feedback with practical recommendations on how to improve future evaluations; 3) report on the quality of evaluations reports; and 4) contribute to corporate knowledge management and organizational learning, by identifying evaluation reports of satisfactory quality to be used in meta-analysis to be shared within the organization, as well as facilitating internal and external sharing of

satisfactory evaluations reports. The GEROS builds on the past knowledge and has considerable potential as a proactive and functional evaluation quality assurance system.

Humanitarian: Another innovation linked originally to the Haiti IA-RTE but now just as likely to inform a future JHIE, is the UNICEF-managed **Inter-Agency Survey of the Affected Population in Haiti**. This survey, a major advancement in how systematically inter-agency actors consult the affected population, stands to produce the most statistically valid and reliable data thus far generated in emergencies on the lives and livelihoods of those affected. In so doing, it not only significantly strengthens the evidence base in a post-emergency settings; it also establishes the baselines for longitudinal impact assessment, potentially through the use of mobile phones. When linked with geospatial data (e.g., markers of which UN agencies, NGOs, clusters, and other actors were active in what parts of the country), this survey also stands to strengthen attribution of progress made (or not made) to inter-agency actors. As such, it has the potential to significantly strengthen accountability to affected populations, a core priority of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee on Humanitarian Action (IASC).

Lessons Learned

Humanitarian: The humanitarian portfolio registered important lessons in 2010. First and foremost, the aforementioned constraints in this portfolio underscored the risks of taking on a large volume of high-visibility project work with limited staff resources, while at the same attempting to address significant and long-standing relational hurdles within the Organization without clear policy guidance to address these. This overabundance of work, coupled with the relations to attend to, diluted the effectiveness of the portfolio, leading to a scenario in which individual project results were compromised (owing to the need to undertake time-consuming internal discussions to explain EO actions and decisions), nor were relational issues adequately addressed (owing in part to the need to attend to the immediate projects at hand). It is provisionally suggested that 2011 therefore focus on producing fewer but higher-quality evaluations, particularly since most of the commitments made for the biennium have already been met. Given the imbalance of the portfolio to date (i.e., with an abundance of inter-agency evaluations) and the need for improved internal relations, the EO also submits that in selecting 2011 evaluations, relatively greater emphasis should be placed on UNICEF-specific evaluations – for example, RTEs of UNICEF’s response – so as to foster a greater spirit of understanding and collaboration on humanitarian evaluation within the Organization. Finally, in order to avoid these challenges in future, there is a need for greater and more systematic guidance from the EO collectively – not merely from individual staff members within the Office – on the issue of independence and what it does (and does not) mean in theory and practice.

Evaluation use: The organisational culture remains weak in responding to evaluation recommendations. While all evaluations conducted at the HQ level tend to accompany management response, at times the process can stretch excessively particularly when a number of divisions/offices are involved. Delayed response to evaluation recommendations can entail significant opportunity cost to the organization. For preparing management response and follow up action plans to major evaluations involving various divisions, a good practice would be to have a clear understanding at the outset regarding the accountability associated with the use of evaluation through the effective and timely completion of management response.

6. Studies, Surveys and Evaluations completed in 2010

Title

1. Evaluation of the UNICEF Education Programme in Timor-Leste, 2003-2009
2. From policies to results. Developing capacities for country M&E systems
3. Education in Emergencies and Post Crisis Transition: A Synthesis of Main Findings from Evaluations (2004-2009)
4. Review of the Global Education Cluster Co-Leadership Arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children
5. Evaluation of UNICEF and Government of Netherlands Programme on Early Childhood Development (Global Synthesis)
6. Evaluation of UNICEF and Government of Netherlands Programme on Early Childhood Development [Country Case Study – Tanzania]
7. Evaluation of UNICEF and Government of Netherlands Programme on Early Childhood Development [Country Case Study – Nepal]
8. Evaluation of UNICEF and Government of Netherlands Programme on Early Childhood Development [Country Case Study – Cambodia]
9. Evaluation of UNICEF and Government of Netherlands Programme on Early Childhood Development [Country Case Study – Ghana]
10. Programme Review Evaluability study of the Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition Programme
11. Final Report: Evaluation of UNICEF's Programme and Work in Relation to Adolescents and the Participation of Children and Young People
12. Unite for Children, Unite against AIDS campaign evaluation