Executive Summary

This report presents progress in meeting the Evaluation Office strategies and targets for 2017, aligned with the Office Management Plan 2014-2017, specifically as follows:

- **Outcome 100**: Global Evidence and Global Evaluation Governance, with outputs including Independent Global-level Evaluations (Output 101) and National Evaluation Capacity Development (Output 102); and
- **Outcome 200**: Global Evaluation Management including Evaluation Leadership (Output 203) and Systemic Strengthening of UNICEF’s Evaluation Function (Output 204)

During the year, the Evaluation Office completed or started a number of major evaluations, syntheses and reviews, and contributed to joint evaluation activities. The Office continued to play a prominent role in evaluation networks, both within the United Nations and with external partners. Within UNICEF a range of activities contributed to further strengthening the decentralized evaluation function, including: important efforts in capacity strengthening for country offices undertaking evaluations of humanitarian action; the planning and coordination of a comprehensive self-assessment of the Evaluation Function, the active participation in the Peer Review of the Evaluation Function and the development of the related Management Response. The Evaluation Office prepared the new Plan for Global Evaluation 2017-21 which was approved by the executive board in September, and started consultations within the community, both in the house and with Member States on the new Evaluation Policy. Both documents underwent a very participatory process that saw renewed engagement in evaluation on the part of the Global Evaluation Committee, as well as by regional and field colleagues.

A number of lessons have also been learned about constraints and efficiencies. The Evaluation Office continued to face an overambitious portfolio, which results in a number of evaluations delivered late or postponed. The new Office Management Plan has reflected on these lessons and proposed a new set up that provides for more efficient distribution of objectives and better prioritization is needed in setting targets. As part of the OMP implementation strategy risks and challenges in working with teams of external consultants will be tackled and resolved.

Introduction

The work of the UNICEF Evaluation Office (EO) is guided by the Office Management Plan (OMP) 2014-2017, translated into an annual work plan (AWP) for each calendar year, with outputs and outcomes consistent with the OMP. The EO OMP has two outcome areas: Global Evidence and Global Evaluation Governance (Outcome 100) and Global Evaluation Management (Outcome 200). The purpose of the present document is to provide a short assessment of progress against each output within the two outcome areas, as well as a brief reflection on lessons learned.

In 2017, the Evaluation Office had 11 established posts of which eight were for international professionals and three for general service staff. Five were international professional project positions. A further 4 staff were in temporary assignments or consultancy positions. The total expenditure by the Evaluation Office was USD 6,829,688 of which nearly USD 2.1 million was from other resources or other resources (emergency). Funding for a range of activities was provided by Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the Lego Foundation.

---

1 The outputs under Outcome 200 were originally listed as Output 201 and Outputs 202. These were renumbered as Output 203 and Output 204 respectively to align with changes in the UNICEF budget framework.
Outcome 100: Global Evidence and Global Evaluation Governance
Output 101: Independent Global-level evaluations

This output area is the core of the EO work-plan both in terms of staff time as well as budget allocations. It includes activities listed under the Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2014-2017.2

The following corporate evaluative products were finalized 2017, in line with the plan for global thematic evaluations 2014–2017: review and update for 2016–2017.

- Evaluation of the H4+ Joint Programme (the joint initiative of six United Nations agencies for technical support of the Global Strategy for Women’s, Children’s and Adolescents’ Health)
- Evaluation of UNICEF strategies and programmes to reduce stunting in children under 5 years of age
- Joint evaluability assessment of the UNFPA-UNICEF Global Programme to Accelerate Action to End Child Marriage
- A Global Evaluation of UNICEF’s Drinking Water Supply Programming in Rural Areas and Small Towns, 2006–2016 was delayed in its implementation and came to completion in October 2017. The report of this evaluation is due in early 2018.

In addition, the following were initiated in 2017:

- Evaluation of the Out-of-School Children Initiative
- Impact evaluation of early childhood development kits in Senegal
- Humanitarian evaluation in Uganda
- Evaluation of the coverage and quality of the UNICEF response in complex humanitarian situations
- Strengthening child protection systems: evaluation of UNICEF strategies and programme performance
- Evaluation of the UNICEF contribution to health systems strengthening
- Evaluation of the UNICEF Gender Action Plan
- Evaluation of the UNICEF-UNFPA joint programme on female genital mutilation/cutting

The Global Evaluation of Girls’ Education portfolio was initiated with a completion date of January 2017. The purpose of the evaluation is to examine the UNICEF’s girls’ education interventions activities and strategies that UNICEF has implemented or supported to improve education outcomes for girls, and to promote gender equality. In addition, the evaluation will assess UNICEF’s contribution towards attaining gender parity in key education measures, and in achieving MDG 2 and MDG3 and related Education for All Goals. It will also assess the efficacy of girls’ education programme strategies. However, the evaluation was delayed, and is anticipated to be completed in mid-2018. In the meantime, a decision was made to update the findings (and associated relevance) by conducting interviews to update some of the initial assessments.

The evaluation on supporting policy and systems improvements in social inclusion, was planned for to commence in 2017, as one of the final evaluation of the strategic plan. Conversation with the Social Policy team

commended to determine various option for scoping. However, the evaluation was eventually dropped due to lack of funding.

An evaluation related to research evidence (support of generation and use of knowledge) was included in the Global Evaluation Plan 2014-2017. Following the scoping exercise, the decision was taken not to pursue this subject as a global evaluation but rather as a strategic review, which will be conducted in 2018.


The scope of the Country Programme Evaluation changed and so did the portfolio for the Evaluation Office for 2018. A draft Concept Note was developed, however the evaluation could not be implemented due to lack of funds.

The planned Capacity Development for Gender-Responsive Evaluations was aimed to support the enhancement of capacities of HQ, RO and COs to undertake gender-responsive evaluations, however the item was dropped due to lack of funds.

The Gender Action Plan II: Evaluability Assessment was deemed no longer necessary as it was more pertained to conduct the analytical review reported above.

In addition, the Evaluation Office contributed to the following evaluations, reports and reviews:

EO staff served on management groups for several evaluations of inter-agency programmes and commissioned by partner agencies including the External Evaluation of the International Coordinating Group on Vaccine Provision (ICG) mechanism (completed in October 2017), the RMNCH Trust Fund (completed November 2017) and the Summative Evaluation of the WHO Rapid Access Expansion Initiative (on-going).

The Evaluation Office commissioned a review of its capacity development initiative for Humanitarian Evaluations. The review found that the initiative met its primary and secondary objectives (increasing staff capacity and increasing good quality evaluations) and that, broadly speaking, the initiative was relevant, effective, efficient. Some limited evidence of impact on the evaluation of Humanitarian Action has already been observed. The quality of evaluations supported by this initiative was of higher quality than those that occurred in the period prior to the training. The review will be used to inform future capacity development initiatives of the Evaluation Office.

**Analysis and Lessons in Conducting Evaluations**

2017 saw important development in the governance of the Evaluation Function in UNICEF: the Audit Advisory Committee was expanded to include an evaluation expert and the establishment of the external Evaluation Advisory Panel. UNICEF continued to engage through UNEG on the proposals of the Secretary-General to strengthen system-wide evaluation. The mapping of initiatives in national evaluation capacity development also laid the foundation for more effective engagement at the country level.

There was also overall improvement in the performance of the evaluation function: greater geographical coverage of evaluations, management responses prepared for almost all evaluations, and evaluations assessed as highly satisfactory also increasing. However, the number of evaluations that are submitted each year by all levels of the
organization is not increasing, while evaluation spending declined slightly from 0.79 to 0.67 per cent of total programme between 2016 and 2017.

In order to respond to the rapidly increasing demand for evaluations to match the growing UNICEF response to crises (from 294 humanitarian situations in 98 country offices in 2014 to 344 humanitarian situations in 108 offices in 2016), the evaluation function will need review its methodologies, and more focused on more rapidly generating the necessary evidence on what is working (or not).

Regarding humanitarian evaluation a few weaknesses have been observed. First, as was noted Reflecting Humanitarian Principles in Evaluation, published by the United Nations Evaluation Group in 2016, the humanitarian principles are often ignored in humanitarian evaluations. The Evaluation Office took steps to address this by commissioning guidance on the subject. Second, the synthesis of humanitarian evaluations mentioned above, Towards Improved Emergency Responses, found that only a third of the evaluations it considered had an assessment of the Core Commitments to Children in Humanitarian Action. Finally, it was noted that previous evaluations of L3 emergency responses have taken over too long to complete. The Office is currently piloting a new method called Rapid and Timely Humanitarian Evaluations (R&THE), to address this.

**Output 102 - National Evaluation Capacity Development**

**NECD Activities in 2017**

The evaluation function in UNICEF aims at contributing to National Evaluation Capacity Development (NECD) for the achievement of the SDGs. NECD work is done at global and county levels in line with UNICEF’s Evaluation Policy, the QCPR, the UN General Assembly Resolution on National Evaluation Capacity Building (A/RES/69/237) and the UN General Assembly Resolution on “Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” (A/RES/70/1). A Peer Review jointly conducted by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the OECD/DAC recommended that the Evaluation Office develop a strategy on NECD to further advance its work in this area.

The Evaluation Office supports UNICEF’s global, regional and country-level initiatives oriented to advocate for, and support, national evaluation capacities’ initiatives. Regional and country requests for NECD significantly increased in 2017 in line with the demands and challenges posed by the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development. At the end of 2017, the Evaluation Office commissioned a mapping exercise on NECD with a view to devising a corporate strategy in this area in 2018. The mapping is expected to be concluded by early April. The corporate strategy is foreseen for mid-2018.

The Evaluation Office has continued its systematic engagement on in inter-agency cooperation and global partnerships for joint NECD activities. In 2017 UNICEF continued to co-lead, together with IOCE, the EVALSDGs global Network. EVALSDGs aims to promote evaluation activities around the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including review and follow-up processes. In addition, the Evaluation Office continues to be an active member of EvalPartners Management Group and of the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE). The Evaluation Office, in close coordination with the Kyrgyzstan CO, successfully supported and contributed to the III Global EvalPartners Forum: “Transforming our world through evaluation: engagement and partnerships for the better world we want”. The Forum was held in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan from 26th to 28th April 2017. This historic event culminated with the endorsement of a Partnership Statement where Civil Society Organizations, UN Organizations, Parliamentarians, Bi-laterals, Multi-laterals, as well as Government representatives renewed their commitment towards more effective NECD for the achievement of the SDGs and to contribute to national enabling
environments for evaluation. One notable achievement in 2017 has been the publication, in partnership with EVALSDGs and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), of a series of Briefing Papers which were IIED’s most downloaded publications in 2016-7.

Analysis and Lessons in NECD

In the context of Agenda 2030 and the emphasis on nationally led development processes, NECD is of increased importance. UNICEF is well placed to continue supporting efforts at the global, regional and country levels together with other UN agencies and with external partners. UNICEF is widely seen to be a strong, experienced and capable partner in this area. The foreseen NECD strategy will indeed support UNICEF to have a more coherent and systematic approach not only to Countries but also to UNICEF Country and Regional Offices. Based on past experience, UNICEF, working through partners, is poised to make a significant contribution. In this vein, UNICEF is to continue its work towards NECD especially with UNEG, EvalPartners, EVALSDGs as well as the GPFE. The Evaluation Office will explore the opportunities for working with other partners on this field as well.

The key lessons are, first, that UNICEF is very well placed to support networks and partnerships to catalyse advocacy and capacity building, and, second, that such networks can greatly extend UNICEF’s profile, reach and influence. Last but not least, UNICEF has learned that if it is to effectively contribute to mainstream evaluation in the 2030 Agenda, then there is a need to reinforce internal capacities as well.

Outcome 200: Global Evaluation Management

The results expected under this outcome area concern setting and implementing the policy framework and systems for the evaluation function within UNICEF and with global partners through provision of leadership and oversight at global, regional and country levels. The Evaluation Office promotes collaboration on evaluation across the organization to enhance the effectiveness of the evaluation function. The overall aim is to continue to strengthen evaluation capacities to promote the generation and use of robust evaluation evidence to support and improve learning and accountability and contribute to achievement of national and corporate strategic goals.

Output 203: Evaluation Leadership

Executive Board

The Evaluation Office provides effective interaction with the UNICEF Executive Board on behalf of the entire decentralized evaluation function, and actively engages with the internal Global Evaluation Committee and other governance bodies, regarding UNICEF implementation of evaluation policy and corporate evaluations. This outputs also covers the Office management of interagency relations.

Evaluation documents were presented at all three sessions of the UNICEF Executive Board in 2016, with more extended presentations made at informal briefings ahead of each session. Each evaluation report was accompanied by a management response. The following products were submitted to the three sessions of the UNICEF Executive Board held in 2017:  
- Evaluation of UNICEF’s Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme (PBEA)  
- Annual Report for 2016 on the Evaluation Function in UNICEF, and a Management Perspective  
• DAC-UNEG peer review of the Evaluation Function of UNICEF and Management Response
• Plan for Global Evaluations 2018-2021

The Global Evaluation Committee (GEC)

The Global Evaluation Committee met several times in 2017, to approve some changes in the membership and mode of operation of the Committee, to consider proposals to strengthen the function to address shortcomings in coverage and implementation of agreed actions in evaluation management responses, and to analyse the findings of the external Peer Review and provide feedback on the management response. The GEC also met in the last quarter of the year to review the draft Plan for Global Evaluations 2018-21, and to provide initial comments on the first draft of discussion Paper to develop the new Evaluation Policy.

Interagency relations and governance

• United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG):

The Director of the Evaluation Office served as UNEG Vice-Chair (Partnerships), one of four UNEG Vice Chairs from May 2014 to May 2017. During this period the contribution of UNICEF to UNEG in terms of partnership has been systematic and relevant. All staff of the Evaluation Office are currently involved in all UNEG task forces including those related to SDGs, partnerships, professionalization, humanitarian work, evaluation use among others. Currently UNICEF is co-managing, together with ITC the mid-term review of UNEG’s strategy; it is also highly involved in the development of UNEG’s partnership strategy. The Evaluation Office also supported UNEG’s advocacy for evaluation efforts particularly through the organization of a side meeting focused Follow-up and Review processes of the Agenda 2030 held during the 2017 High Level Political Forum (HLPF).

• Independent System-wide Evaluation (ISWE):

UN SWAP Review and Analysis: Gender - Active dissemination of UNEG guidance on integrating gender and human rights into evaluation. Internal and externally conducted UN SWAP Review and Analysis. Information sessions on UN SWAP process and active dissemination of UN SWAP results.

As per the requirements in the updated UN-SWAP technical notes of 2016, the Evaluation Office (EO) has fully integrated UN-SWAP assessments and reporting requirements into the Global Evaluation Oversights System (GEROS). For 2016, 100% of evaluation reports submitted to the Evaluation and Research Database were reviewed. As noted previously, UNICEF issues reports of the previous year due to a non-alignment of programme cycles.

During 2016, 101 evaluation reports, have been reviewed for quality by an independent team, according to UNICEF and UN-SWAP standards.

The aggregated average UN-SWAP score for integration of Gender Equality in 2016 was 6.2, which is classified as Approaching Requirements. This is the same as during the 2015 cycle, but for a much larger portfolio of reports (101 reports in 2016 as compared to 61 in 2015). Reports were slightly stronger regarding integrating gender in the scope, indicators, criteria and questions of evaluations. The priority for action to improve UN-SWAP remains to ensure gender analysis is used to inform evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. Reports from MENA and ROSA represent good practice in this regard, rating significantly above the organizational average for UN-SWAP overall. More information of the overall UN-SWAP analytical synthesis (including Performance according to UN-SWAP evaluation criteria and Regional variations in report performance) can found on pages 31.
to 32 of the ‘UNICEF GEROS Meta-Analysis 2016’. The report concludes that, while the integration of human rights based approaches and gender equality commitments has generally improved over time, it has not kept pace with advances in other areas of quality. The expanded evaluation portfolio is still to meet the requirements of UN-SWAP Analysis of the integration of human rights based approaches. Gender equality in GEROS goes beyond the constraints of the UN-SWAP evaluation performance indicator in terms of explicit reference to the rights of the child, the presence or absence of equity considerations, the use of human rights language, and the proportional participation of rights holders and duty bearers. Gender-responsive and human rights-based evaluation designs and analysis remains a challenge across nearly all regions. Substantive improvement in 2017 will be needed if UNICEF is to meet the UN-SWAP standards by the target date established by the UN Evaluation Group. With good performance in other areas of evaluation quality, there is also scope and opportunity to give greater focus in the future to systems strengthening around human rights based approaches and gender equality.

The report recommends to apply the revised UNICEF ToR and evaluation report checklists and UN Evaluation Group guidance to ensure evaluations fully integrate HRBAP and UN-SWAP requirements at the inception stage; with particular focus on using gender as an analytical lens across all evaluation criteria and questions.

Activities supporting the institutionalisation of gender in the evaluation process:

In 2017, the EO has continued to be engaged in the UNEG – SO3 working group on Gender Equality and Human Rights working on a ‘Guidance on evaluating gender mainstreaming’ for UN entities and the revision of the UN-SWAP Technical notes for the evaluation performance indicator in view of the UN-SWAP 2.0 coming into effect in 2018.

The EO:
- updated the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference integrating and referencing UN-SWAP.
- revised the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards which now integrates an entire section on Gender and Human Rights outlining the four UN-SWAP criteria.
- Revised the new GEROS Handbook for UNICEF Staff & Independent Assessors to fully integrated the UN-SWAP requirements.
- prepared GEROS Meta-Analysis 2016 Regional Summaries (7 in total) and each of these reports reflect their regional UN-SWAP rating.

The Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) Steering Group:

The Evaluation Office is a member of the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group, whose roles and responsibilities include the coordination and development of broad strategic guidance on methodological approaches and refinements for IAHEs; developing a prioritized list of IAHEs to be conducted, manage these evaluations through an IAHE Management Group, and ensure that these evaluations are disseminated widely to ensure utilization. Although no IAHE were undertaken in 2017, the EO participated in key meetings to discuss how IAHE would be invigorated and made more relevant and ensure their contribution to improvements of humanitarian action.

The inter agency humanitarian evaluation (IAHE) Steering Group (SG) members continued to face challenges in implementing IAHEs. This included new leadership at various levels, funding, and confusion with respect to the strategic placement of the SG within the IASC structure. The IAHE SG is made up of Evaluation Directors from
several UN agencies, NGO consortium, and ICRC. The SG continued to endeavor to contemplate what should be the relevant strategic positioning of IAHE and the SG. Several meetings between the agencies took place in 2017 with an aim to reach an improved vision and position within the IASC structures. It is hoped that the work done in 2017 will result in a reinvigorated IAHE SG that will support and implement IAHE.

- The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP):

In 2017, the Evaluation Office continued to support the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Learning in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) through an annual membership contribution. ALNAP is a premiere network for evaluations (and its linkages to decision-makers) in the humanitarian realm. The purpose of this partnership is to access first-hand access to state-of-the-field developments and innovations in the humanitarian field, both for the EO and for UNICEF more widely (as EO disseminates latest ALNAP developments throughout the organization); heightened profile of evaluation within ALNAP’s broader range of priorities; enhanced opportunities to convey UNICEF developments to the humanitarian sector; increased networking opportunities with counterparts in other organizations.

One of the key feature of ALNAP’s Strategic Plan is ‘to create a high-quality evidence base for evaluations’. In this area, ALNAP aims to improve the quality of evaluations of humanitarian assistance and related research and learning activities, and to provide a key repository of knowledge for the humanitarian system. It was through this that ALNAP developed the Evaluation of Humanitarian Action (EHA) Guide to help humanitarian actors increase the quality and usefulness of evaluation findings and results. In 2016–2017, the finalized EHA Guide was launched. The Evaluation Office has used this guide to enhance capacities of UNICEF staff in EHA through the Capacity Building Programme.

Finally, it should be noted that UNICEF took part in the Annual Review of ALNAP in 2017, and made a presentation on HPM and Ebola evaluation during the meeting.

Output 204: Systemic Strengthening of UNICEF’s Evaluation Function

Contributing towards strengthening UNICEF’s decentralized evaluation function is a key role of the EO through which it influences and supports the coverage, quality and use of evaluations.

1. Quality Review and Assurance Systems:

Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS):

GEROS is a system that effectively contributes to greater credibility and transparency of the Evaluation function in UNICEF. In 2017 GEROS has contributed as well to promote learning and horizontal exchange; and to greater quality, use and coverage of the evaluation function.

In 2017 the UNEG Peer Review confirmed the value and contribution of GEROS to the overall evaluation function. It suggested the Evaluation Office to further work on using the knowledge and evidence proceeding from evaluations to reinforce internal capacities, to promote peer learning and to further enhance use of evaluations for accountability and learning.
In 2017, the 2016 GEROS meta-analysis was produced based on the quality assessment of all evaluation reports submitted for quality rating in the previous year. This year the GEROs meta-analysis was enhanced with regional analyses. The Evaluation Office also produced, in 2017, a GEROS handbook as well as a new and updated guidance on UNICEF evaluations reporting standards and a checklist for evaluation Terms of Reference. Through GEROS and as it is now a regular practice, the 15 best evaluations were publicly announced.

PRIME, ERDB, EMRTS

In 2017, the Evaluation Office continued to support the use and functionality of the Planning for Research, Impact Monitoring and Evaluation System (PRIME), the Evaluation and Research Database (ERDB) and the Evaluation Management Response Tracking System (EMRTS). Specifically, the EO fixed technical glitches, addressed questions raised by staff and continued to support staff in the use of these systems. Updates to guidance documents for these information systems were will be synchronized with the finalization of the efforts to bring all evidence information systems (ERDB, PRIME, EMRTS) under one platform.

Integration of Evaluation and Research Databases

An information system currently under development for 2018 seeks to integrate the various information systems that currently exist for evaluation and research, bringing together:

- PRIME (Planning for Research, Impact Monitoring and Evaluation system), responsible for collecting information about planned and on-going evidence activities.
- ERDB (Evaluation and Research Database), stores completed evidence works.
- GEROS (Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System), assesses the quality of UNICEF’s evaluations.
- EMRTS (Evaluation Management Response Tracking System), tracks actions taken by UNICEF management in response to evaluation recommendations.

Across the evaluation and research community it was recognized that these two areas needed an integrated database and information management system that enables the organization to: (i) share identical information, or aggregate related information; (ii) meet current business processes, policy and procedural requirements; (iii) accurate and flexible reporting and exporting data; (iv) user-friendly interfaces and experiences, and (v) data integrity held within the systems. The integrated system will streamline the information flow and provide UNICEF with a stable and information-rich platform to support every phase of research and evaluation generation, from planning and implementation, to reporting, quality assurance, management response and archiving.

2. Knowledge products:

During the period under review, to assist evaluation managers and evaluators the EO produced guidance documents on the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System, UNICEF Evaluation Reporting Standards and evaluation TOR checklist. In addition, the EO also conducted various webinars and brown bag lunches to disseminate knowledge on evaluation methodology and evaluations that have been conducted. The webinars that were done were organized jointly by the EO and EVALSDGs. Furthermore, evaluation briefs were also produced on the various evaluations and work that the EO is doing. Evalnews, the EO’s thematic bimonthly newsletter continued to be produced and disseminated internally and externally through various practitioner networks and list serves. The EO also created a YouTube channel to share videos of webinars done by the evaluation office.
The production and dissemination of EvalNews on a bimonthly basis continued in 2017 with a thematic focus. Of particular relevance is the section on Voices from the Field where Country Offices share their experience on managing evaluations, on using evaluations; on national evaluation capacity development among other themes.

The **Evaluation Community of Practice** continued to serve as a platform that the EO uses to disseminate information on new products, evaluation resources and upcoming events such as webinars. It is envisaged that in future the platform will be used more for staff to interact with each other and share their ideas on evaluation thereby harness the evaluation knowledge of staff.

### 3. Capacity development

The Evaluation Office continued its efforts towards internal capacity development in 2017. The main focus was on increasing access to knowledge and cutting-edge practices through evaluation-related webinars. Three webinars were launched in 2017; two of them in partnership with EVALSDGs, on the topics of impact evaluation, evaluation and the SDGs; and Voluntary National Review Reports. The Evaluation Office continued participating in regional networking meetings. It also continued providing systematic support to regional offices as well as to some country offices. The Evaluation Office manages the evaluation help-desk; through this means, queries are resolved and ad-hoc technical advice is provided to both country and regional offices.

The Evaluation Office continued its initiative to develop capacity to evaluate humanitarian action. The initiative uses a learning-by-doing model in which staff and their partners managing evaluations at the decentralized level are invited to a series of workshops and provided with one-on-one support. Their evaluations serve as case studies for the training. The initiative has supported 83 UNICEF staff (from five regional offices and 25 country offices) and 13 government partners. Twenty humanitarian evaluations have been supported, of which eight have been completed and uploaded the ERDB.
Annex I. List of Evaluations Completed

Reducing Stunting in Children Under 5 Years of Age: A comprehensive evaluation of UNICEF’s strategies and programme performance – Global synthesis report

Endline evaluation of the H4+ Joint Programme Canada and Sweden (Sida) 2011–2016


### Annex II: Main Results Achieved in 2017 in Relation to AWP Targets and Indicators

#### Performance with respect to key activities planned under Output 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned outputs</th>
<th>Status at end 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmatic Portfolio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation of UNICEF approaches to strengthening of national health systems.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Girls Education Evaluation</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WASH Rural Water Supply global evaluation: Global evaluation of UNICEF's water supply programming in rural areas and small towns</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Innovation for Development Evaluation</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthen child protection systems</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ECD Kit Evaluation</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of School Initiative (OOSCI)</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WASH ASWA II Evaluation &amp; VFM</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint UNFPA-UNICEF H4+ evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action to end Child Marriage: Global Programme to accelerate action to end child marriage, evaluability exercise.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint UNFPA/UNICEF FGM/C Evaluation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immunization programming: Scoping for an evaluation of the immunization roadmap to be conducted 2018-2019.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology in development</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy Development in Social Protection</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of Evaluations of UNICEF WASH programming 2007-2015:</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanitarian Portfolio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IAHE Multi-country</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-country Research Evaluation</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ECD Kit Humanitarian Evaluations</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coverage and Quality Evaluation in CHTE</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support the functioning of ALNAP through financial support and leading a variety of initiatives to enhance evaluation of humanitarian action</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanitarian Response in complex settings</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Synthesis of findings on protracted emergencies</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Effectiveness Portfolio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender Action Plan: Scoping exercise for this 2017 global thematic evaluation</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender Action Plan II: Evaluability assessment.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex III: Format for Evaluations, Research, Surveys, and Publications Completed

**Completed evaluations, research, studies, surveys and publications** (report finalized and ready to be uploaded in the Global Evaluation Database) in 2017.

**Title:** Reducing Stunting in Children Under 5 Years of Age: A comprehensive evaluation of UNICEF’s strategies and programme performance – Global synthesis report  
**Year:** 2017  
**Sequence number:** 2017/003  
**Type of report:** Evaluation  
**Themes:** Nutritional surveys and status; data systems; SitAns  
**Management response:** Yes

**Title:** Endline evaluation of the H4+ Joint Programme Canada and Sweden (Sida) 2011-2016  
**Sequence number:** 2017/010  
**Year:** 2017  
**Type of report:** Evaluation  
**Themes:** Health sectoral or partnership  
**Management response:** No

**Title:** UNICEF WASH Action in Humanitarian Situations: Synthesis of Evaluations 2010–2016  
**Sequence number:** 2017/012  
**Type of report:** Review  
**Themes:** WASH-Other WASH  
**Management response:** No

**Title:** Towards Improved Emergency Responses Synthesis of UNICEF Evaluations of Humanitarian Action 2010-2016  
**Sequence number:** 2017/009  
**Type of report:** Review  
**Themes:** Multi-thematic emergencies

**Title:** Equity, sustainability and scalability in UNICEF WASH in schools programming: Evidence from UNICEF evaluations 2007-2015  
**Sequence number:** 2017/011  
**Type of report:** Review  
**Themes:** WASH - School WASH services

Other publications (print, CD, video) that were issued by your Office during 2017. Please provide the following information for each

**Title:** Evaluation and the SDGs  
**Audience:** Evaluation managers, evaluators, programme managers. The video seeks to disseminate knowledge on SDG evaluation  
**Authors:** UNICEF  
**Quantities:** Electronic only
**Estimated Cost:** Estimated cost of the publication to UNICEF (i.e. estimated UNICEF funds spent on research, writing, editing, copy-editing, design,

**Title:** Evaluation and Voluntary National Reviews  
**Audience:** Evaluation managers, evaluators, programme managers. The video seeks to disseminate knowledge on the voluntary national reviews of the SDGs that have been done to date.  
**Authors:** UNICEF  
**Quantities:** Electronic only  
**Estimated Cost:** Estimated cost of the publication to UNICEF (i.e. estimated UNICEF funds spent on research, writing, editing, copy-editing, design,

**Title:** Reducing Stunting in Children Under Five Years of Age: An Evaluation of UNICEF’s Strategies and Programme Performance  
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