1. Executive Summary

For the Evaluation Office (EO), the year 2013 provided significant opportunities with a few major achievements and some challenges as well.

The Executive Board interest in evaluation seems to have grown, with demands for increased frequency and more substantive reporting on evaluation. In response, the number of evaluation items presented in Board meetings increased to four, allowing UNICEF to benefit from a stronger engagement with the Board.

The review of the 2008 Evaluation Policy was concluded successfully and the Board approved a revised policy in June. The new policy, which noted significant changes in the underlying principles, accountabilities, and resourcing commitments, was viewed as among the most complete policies of the development agencies.

On system-side matters, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) formulated a new strategy to which UNICEF made significant contributions. The EO staff continued to co-chair the UNEG Joint Evaluation Taskforce and the UNEG on National Evaluation Capacity Development Taskforce. UNICEF was also a lead force in mobilizing the evaluation community through the EvalPartners initiative. In addition, two joint evaluations were completed in 2013: the Joint Evaluation of Joint Programmes on Gender Equality in the United Nations System and the Joint UNFPA/UNICEF Evaluation of the Joint Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) Programme.

Among programme / institutional evaluations, completion of the Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies (CPiE) as well as progress made on the Evaluation of Upstream Engagement in Basic Education and Gender Equality (draft stage) and a global water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) strategy evaluation on Community Approaches to Total Sanitation (draft stage) were key achievements. The evaluation of Monitoring Results for Equity Systems (MORES) and Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) have seen significant progress.

The Evaluation of UNICEF’s Cluster Lead Agency Role in Humanitarian Action (CLARE) and Evaluation of UNICEF’s Preparedness Systems (EmPrep) were the main reports of UNICEF’s humanitarian action of 2013. In addition, the EO continued to provide leadership and technical support to a number of joint and inter-agency evaluations, notably the Review of the Fast Track Recruitment Policy, the West and Central Africa Regional Office-led Real-time Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to the Mali Crisis, and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs-led Evaluation of the Emergency Response Fund (ERF).

To further strengthen UNICEF’s decentralized evaluation function a new evaluation database system was institutionalized to improve access to evaluations; an updated and well-advanced management response tracking system was launched to ensure the use of evaluations; the feedback loop in the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) was improved to enhance evaluation quality; and an internal e-learning programme was launched to strengthen Monitoring & Evaluation staff performance.

With respect to constraints and gaps, lack of adequate budget allocation in a timely manner to implement corporate evaluations caused cancellation of some planned activities. Delay in completing evaluations remains a common issue although some merit is seen in allowing sufficient time to digest the draft evaluation findings and adequate preparation of the final report. On the administration side, that a senior evaluation specialist post (humanitarian) has been vacant since April was a key concern.
2. Key Divisional Targets and Strategies

In 2013, the Evaluation Office (EO) committed itself to the following function / result areas as per the Office Management Plan (OMP).

**Intermediate Result 1 - UNICEF Evaluation Leadership:** Secure senior management attention and commitment to execute their accountabilities according the Evaluation Policy.

*Strategies:* secure management engagement; corporate reports and recommendations; set strategic direction of EO; equal focus on management efficiency as well as programme results.

**Intermediate Result 2 - Inter-UN and Global Coordination on Evaluation Issues:** Contribute to improved accountability and coherence of the UN and international evaluation system, and to appropriate joint evaluation initiatives.

*Strategies:* strengthen inter-agency evaluation norms and standards; implement coherent approaches in substantive themes; conduct joint evaluations; establish a formal external advocacy agenda for evaluation.

**Intermediate Result 3 - Independent Corporate-Level Programmatic Evaluations:** Deliver a set of priority evaluations that permits corporate analysis of the contribution of UNICEF to global strategies in collaboration with key partners, particularly the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

*Strategies:* update corporate evaluation priorities; add senior level review; select implementation managers based on independence needs; clearly link to research function; separation of evaluation and research roles.

**Intermediate Result 4 - Humanitarian Evaluations:** Deliver a set of priority independent real-time and thematic evaluations of humanitarian action, leading to decisions based on sound information on the fulfilment of UNICEF’s core commitments in humanitarian crises.

*Strategies:* conduct real-time evaluations; conduct independent evaluations of discrete crises and cross-cutting themes; support division-led and country-led efforts; greater emphasis on real-time evaluations.

**Intermediate Result 5 - Institutional Effectiveness:** Deliver a set of priority evaluations on operational functions or the management of key organizational transitions that permit corporate decisions to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

*Strategies:* conduct evaluations of operational functions; conduct evaluations of institutional transitions and development cooperation; employ methods with both global and country level focus; reinstallation of the full institutional effectiveness evaluation portfolio.
Intermediate Result 6 - Central Level Evaluation Capacities: Ensure that corporate level stakeholders can execute their Evaluation Policy-mandated technical and managerial accountabilities for discrete evaluations and for correlated planning, guidance, and utilization.

*Strategies:* strengthen corporate level capacities to meet evaluation policy accountabilities; maximize uptake of findings through diverse means; develop policy briefs based on field level and corporate level evaluations.

Intermediate Result 7 - Systemic Strengthening of the Decentralized Evaluation Function: Continue to develop the capacities of field offices to meet their evaluation accountabilities and needs through a multi-initiative Global Compact between Headquarters (HQ) and Regional Offices (ROs).

*Strategies:* technical guidance and senior management mobilization; develop field office capacities via an integrated strategy; support the HQ-RO programme of national evaluation capacity building; development of a comprehensive Human Resources (HR) strategy for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).
3. Analysis of Strategies and Results in 2013 relation to the 2012-13 Office Management Plan

**Result 1 - UNICEF Evaluation Leadership:** Secure senior management attention and commitment to execute their accountabilities according to the Evaluation Policy.

**Analysis of main results achieved:** A set of priority global evaluations for the 2014-2017 strategic plan period was developed with participatory inputs from senior organization leaders and regional colleagues. In contrast with earlier plans, it covers a longer period, expands the types of efforts included (e.g. methodological development), and was directly anchored to the evidence needs of the strategic plan. The plan is expected to be approved during the February 2014 Executive Board sessions.

The core budget of the EO has historically not been sufficient to deliver the planned evaluations and must be annually supplemented. There were major improvements in 2013. Most importantly, the amount of core resources allocated to evaluation was doubled starting in 2014, which halves the persistent annual gap and makes it more likely that the evaluation plan can be completely implemented. Evaluation was also added as a dedicated budget line within the thematic funding allotments, although this failed to generate all the funds needed in 2013. The 2013 Evaluation Plan was forced to defer some activities to 2014 due to funding shortfalls.

UNICEF continued to benefit from strong Executive Board interest in evaluation. Based on the decision made by the Board in 2012, the number of evaluation items presented in Board meetings increased to four. A new session in February reported the results of three completed global evaluations, and the management responses by UNICEF. The June Board sessions considered three items: a) a thematic review of evaluation evidence in humanitarian programming; b) the annual report of the evaluation function; and c) consideration of the revised Evaluation Policy. Of particular note was the expansion of the number of management responses expected of UNICEF. This has increased from zero (pre-2012) to one in 2012 (the thematic review of evaluation evidence) to two in 2013 (2012 plus the session on global evaluations) to three in 2014 (2013 plus the annual report).

The review of the Evaluation Policy in place since 2008 was successfully concluded with the approval of a revised policy by the June 2013 Executive Board. The revisions turned out to be more extensive than had been anticipated, but place the policy among the most complete of all development agencies. Major changes were made in the underlying principles, accountabilities, and resourcing commitments. Entirely new content was added covering performance standards for the evaluation function and expected topical coverage. UNICEF promised to develop a correlated implementation strategy for the revised policy which will cover the specific actions needed to implement it.

In common with the rest of headquarters locations, a strategic view for evaluation over the 2014-2017 period was developed in the Office Management Plan (OMP). Changes made at the systemic level (e.g. how activities are categorized and funded according to harmonized UN categories) led to major changes in the programme structure starting in 2014. The revised structure will be the following:

- As part of the public goods delivering **Advocacy, Programme Development and Inter-Country Programme** element of the global OMP, the EO will deliver
  - Independent Global-Level Evaluations, and support to
  - National Evaluation Capacity Development
b. As part of the Management Results of the global OMP, the EO will deliver results within
   - UNICEF Evaluation Leadership, and within the
   - Systemic Strengthening of UNICEF’s Evaluation Function (PCR 2/2)

**Shortfalls/constraints:** The allocation of an adequate budget in a timely manner to implement the corporate evaluation plan prevented completion of some activities in 2013 but is forecast to ease in 2014.

**Result 2 - Inter-UN and Global Coordination on Evaluation Issues:** Contribute to improved accountability and coherence of the UN and international evaluation system, and to appropriate joint evaluation initiatives.

**Analysis of main results achieved:** The year 2013 marks a key milestone for the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). Based on an independent assessment of UNEG conducted in 2012, a new strategy was formulated in 2013 for 2014 – 2019. The strategy outlines how the group will continue to support its members and partners as they strengthen the independence, credibility and use of evaluation and how it will inform UN reform processes and cooperate with the global evaluation community. It identifies four strategic objectives:

a. Evaluation functions and products of UN entities meet the UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation;
b. UN entities and partners use evaluation in support of accountability and programme learning;
c. Evaluation informs UN system-wide initiatives and emerging demands; and
d. UNEG benefits from and contributes to an enhanced global evaluation profession.

The EO made significant contributions to the formulation of UNEG’s new strategy by participating in key stages of the process (including a meeting of UNEG Heads in Rome) and building on its past track record, it will be playing an active role in several strategic areas.

UNICEF continued to co-chair the **UNEG Joint Evaluation Taskforce** which has finalized a resource pack on planning and managing joint evaluations for use by UNEG member agencies. The resource pack includes a guidance document and a toolkit. In addition, the taskforce continued to disseminate the guidance on UNDAF evaluation and respond to specific queries related to the guidance.

The **UNEG National Evaluation Capacity Development Taskforce** was successfully coordinated and co-led by the EO. A key output from the group was the UNEG practical tips on how to strengthen national evaluation systems.

UNICEF was the lead agency for the **UNEG Evaluation Practice Exchange (EPE)** was held in New York at UNICEF House. UNICEF also took the lead in setting up the EPE organizing committee which was co-chaired with Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

The organizing committee focused on delivering an EPE that was dynamic and interactive, using differing formats and ensuring there was sufficient time for in-depth discussions of the six themes covered as well as time for networking and deeper knowledge exchange and learning among UN evaluation practitioners.
According to the participants’ feedback, the EPE was well received. Participants particularly liked the option of having six thematic sessions with the ability to choose which sessions they wanted to attend. They also appreciated the space for in-depth discussions and networking which clearly enhanced knowledge exchange and learning.

The EO has also engaged catalytically in the discussions related to the system-wide evaluation which have culminated in the issuance of a “Policy for Independent System-wide Evaluation of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System”. The document was issued in response to the General Assembly resolution 67/226 which requests the Secretary General to establish an interim coordination mechanism for system-wide evaluation of operational activities. As stated in the policy document, the independent system-wide evaluations are expected to assess whether the United Nations system effectively exploits opportunities for programmatic and operational synergies and draws on the capacities of all relevant entities, with a view to enhancing system-wide coherence and impact, so that the total of the work of the UN system for development is larger than the sum of the individual parts. Independent system-wide evaluations should promote learning to inform strategy and policy development, and serve as an important instrument to enhance the accountability of the UN system and its contribution to the greater good of the people of the world.

UNICEF will need to rely on experience and lessons learned in implementing the policy and its institutionalization in the coming years. As the policy relies heavily on the existing mechanism, there will be a need to strengthen the existing system-wide evaluation capacity, particularly of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), in delivering adequately against the various system-wide evaluation demands.

In collaboration with the Division of Governance and Multilateral Affairs (GMA), the EO responded in a timely manner to various queries related to the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR). In addition, the EO provided objective feedback on JIU’s plan of work and also reviewed terms of references for six evaluations, including one examining UN’s decentralized evaluation function. UNICEF’s engagement with JIU has increased significantly in recent years and so has the demand on the EO and other parts of the organization in responding effectively to their requests.

The Joint Evaluation of Joint Programmes on Gender Equality in the United Nations System was completed. It was commissioned to address a gap in evaluative evidence on country-level joint gender programmes (JGPs). It was jointly managed by UNICEF, United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F), and the Governments of Norway and Spain.

The evaluation demonstrated the added value JGPs as a development cooperation modality in the UN system. It found that JGPs have not led to increased efficiencies, mainly due to systemic barriers, unclear management arrangements and weak design processes. It found that JGPs remain an accepted and integral part of the development cooperation landscape and it provided valuable lessons to strengthen future JGPs.

The Joint Evaluation of the Joint UNFPA/UNICEF FGM/C Programme was also completed. The evaluation aimed to assess how far and under what circumstances or country contexts the UNFPA-UNICEF joint programme had succeeded in accelerating the abandonment of FGM/C in programme countries over the last four years (2008-2012). The evaluation, the first of its kind, is a useful learning exercise while ensuring accountability to donors and other stakeholders. The evaluation was managed
by a joint evaluation management group and supported by a reference group which drew membership from both organizations. The evaluation focused on thirteen countries where the joint FGM/C programme is being implemented. Of these, four countries (namely Burkina Faso, Kenya, Senegal and Sudan) were selected as case study countries. The evaluation assesses the relevance, efficiency, sustainability and effectiveness of the holistic and multi-sectoral approach adopted by UNFPA and UNICEF in their programme for the acceleration of the abandonment of FGM/C. Furthermore, it examines the quality of the coordination mechanisms that have been established at the global level and within countries to maximize the effectiveness of joint programme interventions.

The evaluation has been disseminated widely both inside and outside the UN system. A joint management response was formulated and an informal Board Session was organized in January 2014. A major opportunity for dissemination and absorption of the evaluation was at the International Conference “Action to Achieve Commitments in UNGA Resolution 67/146 Intensifying global efforts for the elimination of female genital mutilations” which took place in October 2013 in Rome. The conference included a high-level segment as well as a three day workshop at which representatives from over 25 governments, civil society organizations, parliamentarians, human rights defenders, regional inter-governmental institutions and United Nations agencies had the opportunity to renew commitments, consolidate learning and use the evaluation findings to inform planning. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation were presented in detail and they were used directly during the sessions devoted to the planning of the second phase of the joint programme.

**Shortfalls/constraints:** UNEG has formulated a new strategy but has partly lost a year in transition though UNICEF kept its role active in areas where it provides leadership. On system-wide evaluation architecture, there will be a need for vigilance until the current approach ripens and gains maturity as an operationally functional system.

**Result 3 - Independent Corporate-Level Programmatic Evaluations:** Deliver a set of priority evaluations that permits corporate analysis of the contribution of UNICEF to global strategies in collaboration with key partners, particularly the achievement of the MDGs.

**Analysis of main results achieved:** In 2013, programme evaluations remained the strongest component of the OMP with evaluations focusing on child protection, education, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and nutrition.

In child protection, the corporate evaluation of UNICEF programmes to protect children in emergencies was completed. It is an ambitious evaluation which examines UNICEF’s performance against the Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP, now known as the Strategic Plan) results and the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs) in relation to child protection in emergencies (CPiE). It also assesses the effectiveness of the Child Protection Strategy – system building and promoting social change – in emergency contexts. The evaluation includes detailed case studies of four countries (Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Pakistan, and South Sudan) and also involved an extensive desk review and survey of eight additional countries (Afghanistan, Haiti, Myanmar, occupied Palestinian Territories, Philippines, Somalia, Sri Lanka, and Sudan). Despite the data and information gaps that characterize the emergency world, the evaluation examined all three components of the emergency cycle - preparedness planning, emergency response, and recovery - and drew much needed evidence on outcomes achieved and on what works and does not work in protecting children in conflict and natural disaster contexts. Key recommendations include addressing the need to
better align the Child Protection Strategy and the CCCs, addressing the need for stronger human-rights based advocacy, improving UNICEF’s guidance in specific areas and strengthening local capacity.

In nutrition, the evaluation of community management of acute severe malnutrition (CMAM) was completed and was disseminated widely internally and among the national and international partners. The evaluation conclusions focus on the relevance of CMAM, CMAM effectiveness and quality of services, promoting equity in access, progress in national ownership, efficiency – costs, and supply and delivery of Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food (RUTF), and sustainability and scaling up of CMAM. The findings of the evaluation which include in-depth case studies for Pakistan, Nepal, Ethiopia, Chad, and Kenya were well received at the CMAM Forum Conference held in London in October and attended by over 200 participants.

The evaluation of upstream engagement in basic education and gender equality is nearing completion. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which UNICEF engages strategically in education sector policy articulation and advocacy at the global and regional levels, and determine if those efforts translate to desired transformations in education sector policy and practice at the national level. From the review of global, regional and country level documents, the following definition of upstream engagement was adopted: “UNICEF activities which were intended to have had a system-wide, sustainable impact on the national capacities of public sector duty bearers in the education sector for fulfilling children’s rights, directly or indirectly.”

Launched in 2012, the Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy in Conflict-Affected Contexts Programme (PBEA) is a four-year programme aimed at strengthening resilience, social cohesion and human security in selected countries at risk of conflict, experiencing conflict, or recovering from conflict. The PBEA is currently being implemented in fourteen countries, and funded by the Government of the Netherlands over the period 2012 - 2015. In 2013, the EO commissioned an evaluability assessment of the PBEA which involved extensive data collection through systematic document review and analysis, stakeholder interviews, as well as field visits to three country programmes. The evaluability assessment concluded that if viewed as a unified global programme, the PBEA faces significant challenges in terms of its “evaluation readiness”. However, if viewed from a different perspective as a global approach applied to programmes in diverse country contexts, three to four country programmes only require a few inputs to make them evaluable, while the remaining programmes require major inputs. To that end, the evaluability assessment offers advice and recommendations on how to improve the programme and bring it to the required level of evaluation readiness. The assessment also recommended an end-of-programme evaluation strategy that assesses the contribution of the PBEA for each country programme, with a subsequent global aggregation of findings into an evaluation synthesis.

A global WASH strategy evaluation on ‘Community Approaches to Total Sanitation’ (CATS) was implemented and reached the draft final report stage in December 2013. The evaluation included five country case studies, a global survey, a global document review, numerous key informant interviews, and a consultative webinar with selected UNICEF staff. Implementation was slowed by consulting team weaknesses, but terrific cooperation between the EO and the WASH section allowed the proper reactions and the evaluation regained its footing. It is expected to deliver a very useful report. An extensive dissemination process is expected in 2014, as UNICEF is anxious to determine if this strategy should be scaled up across the globe.
**Shortfalls/constraints:** The OMP included an evaluation of UNICEF’s work on communications for development (C4D). However, this evaluation was postponed to 2014 due to a funding gap. For several evaluations, delay in implementation remained an issue caused mainly by scheduling issues for field visits and time taken for review of draft reports. While it is crucial to allow sufficient time for field data collection and for review, the EO is identifying ways to ensure a one-year implementation schedule for evaluations. These include having additional members in the evaluation team (so that data can be gathered simultaneously) and negotiating a time frame in advance for field visits and reviews.

**Result 4 - Humanitarian Evaluations:** Deliver a set of priority independent real-time and thematic evaluations of humanitarian action, leading to decisions based on sound information on the fulfilment of UNICEF’s core commitments in humanitarian crises.

**Analysis of main results achieved:** The Evaluation of UNICEF’s Cluster Lead Agency Role in Humanitarian Action (CLARE) and the Evaluation of UNICEF’s Preparedness Systems (EmPrep) were the main reports of UNICEF’s humanitarian action of 2013 on the fulfilment of UNICEF’s Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs).

The Evaluation of UNICEF’s Cluster Lead Agency Role in Humanitarian Action (CLARE) assessed the performance of UNICEF as a Cluster Lead Agency (CLA) and area of responsibility (AOR) focal point at global and country levels. The evaluation sought to generate evidence regarding the results achieved or not achieved by UNICEF in undertaking these roles. Primarily intended for use by UNICEF senior management, the evaluation has contributed to improving how UNICEF undertakes its CLA and AOR roles within the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) cluster system.

Overall, the evaluation found evidence that UNICEF has invested significantly in implementing its CLA role since the beginning of the IASC cluster system and is increasingly implementing its CLA roles well. The evaluation concluded, however, that UNICEF’s ability to carry out its CLA role well is limited because it is undertaking its activities in more situations and over a prolonged period of time, above and beyond the role that activated clusters are designed to play. This continuous and uncontrolled growth in cluster scope stretches resources by spreading efforts and resources over more countries and there are no clear, established priorities that are based on risk. This limits the ability of global clusters to provide high-quality support. This is driven by critical internal and external stakeholders, including donors and national governments, their competing interests, and contextual factors such as gaps in non-cluster systems for preparedness and sectoral development coordination. While a significant amount of continuous and uncontrolled growth in cluster scope is linked to how the overarching system has employed clusters, UNICEF’s own lack of consistency in advocating for cluster rationalization at country level is also a factor.

The Evaluation of UNICEF’s Preparedness Systems (EmPrep) is in the final review stages. The evaluation examines the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, connectedness, sustainability and coverage of UNICEF’s current Emergency Preparedness (EP) systems across its global operations. Its main purpose is to help UNICEF become better braced for the wide range of emergencies it faces and to mitigate the effects of emergencies when they do occur.

UNICEF has made progress in incorporating EP into its operations, and these measures have likely contributed to better emergency response, however, integration of EP has been ad-hoc and limited in nature. This evaluation observed that UNICEF’s humanitarian activities are orientated towards emergency response more than preparation or mitigation. Constraints identified in this report which hinder contribution to improved EP include deficiencies in the articulation of vision, goals, definitions
In addition, the EO continued to provide leadership and technical support to a number of joint and inter-agency evaluations, notably, the Review of the Fast Track Recruitment Policy, the West and Central Africa Regional Office-led Real-time Evaluation (RTE) of UNICEF’s Response to the Mali Crisis, and the OCHA-led Evaluation of the Emergency Response Fund.

The Review of the Fast Track Recruitment Policy (FTRP) sought to determine the overall effectiveness of the Fast Track Recruitment Process in meeting UNICEF’s need for timely, qualified personnel in the emergencies in which it has been used, and in so in a manner consistent with broader organizational priorities (e.g. general rules and regulations governing staffing, risk management, cost-effectiveness, efficiency and competitiveness within the industry).

The Real-time Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to the Mali Crisis, led by WCARO, provided the concrete and practical recommendation to scale-up UNICEF’s planning and response for the Level 2 Mali humanitarian crisis. The RTE found that UNICEF played an important role in the initial phase of the humanitarian response in 2012, but the organization was encountering some challenges in scaling up the response in 2013 and easing the transition to recovery and development.

The first global Evaluation of the Emergency Response Fund (ERF) mechanism, managed by OCHA, was particularly relevant to UNICEF which has been the largest single recipient of ERF support since its inception. The results of the evaluation aimed to inform the review of the ERF Guidelines 2013 at the global level, and provide improvements in ERF management at the country level. It is worth noting that notwithstanding some specific shortfalls, the evaluation underscored that the ERF works and it has, and is, making valuable contribution to the attainment of humanitarian outcomes. This is, however, affected by the quality of OCHA leadership at the country level. The ERF mechanism is faster than other UN instruments, but it has not been able to become a catalytic instrument to mobilize resources. In addition, more work needs to be done to strengthen monitoring and evaluation and address questions related to the impact of ERFS.

The EO presented to the Executive Board a Thematic Synthesis Report on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action in June. This synthesis report provided an overview of the state of evaluation of humanitarian action within UNICEF from 2008 to 2012 by summarizing evaluation coverage and quality, major themes emerging and evaluation use and utilisation. The report revealed that UNICEF is producing an increasing number of high-quality evaluations in the humanitarian field, and most importantly UNICEF uses these evaluations to promote positive change. However, the report points out that UNICEF’s level of evaluation effort must be better tailored to its broad learning and accountability needs. Similarly, UNICEF needs to boost capacity to conduct evaluation of humanitarian action at the decentralized level. Gaps in capacity are not limited to the decentralized level, but also at headquarters where expectations for high-quality evaluation are likely to increase with the new demands of the Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure (CEAP) and the Transformative Agenda and with the growing number of emergencies and vulnerable populations.
The EO continued to engage effectively with the **Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP)** on improving both the quality of the humanitarian evidence base and the capacity of the humanitarian system to conduct high-quality evaluations. Towards this end, the EO provided technical support to the development of the ALNAP Pilot Guide on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action in 2013. Moreover, the EO is in the process of developing an e-learning course, in partnership with ALNAP and EvalPartners, on evaluating humanitarian action. The e-learning is intended to be extremely valuable in helping to increase capacity of conducting evaluation of humanitarian action, especially that of Government and NGOs partners.

**Shortfalls/constraints:** The limited capacity to meet increasing internal demands for evaluation of UNICEF’s humanitarian action, while continuing to participate in joint or inter-agency evaluations coupled with the delays in recruiting the senior evaluation specialist and the departure of one middle-level professional before the end of contract created high-work volume on the remaining personnel. The need to promote greater capacity to conduct evaluation of humanitarian action at the decentralized level also poses a new workload on the EO.

**Result 5 - Institutional Effectiveness:** Deliver a set of priority evaluations on operational functions or the management of key organizational transitions that permit corporate decisions to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

**Analysis of main results achieved:** The formative **Evaluation of the Monitoring Results for Equity System (MoRES)** is currently reaching its final stage as the evaluation team has completed the data collection and entering the data analysis phase. This evaluation will help UNICEF better articulate and fine-tune the MoRES concept and provide important lessons on key approaches to reach UNICEF’s equity objectives.

In line with UNICEF’s equity strategy as articulated in the strategic plan 2014-2017, the purpose of this complex evaluation exercise is to provide conceptual clarity and an independent validation of the technical and practical viability of MoRES by drawing on the experience of how the approach has been implemented within the organization. Given the dynamic and evolving nature of MoRES, the evaluation also seeks to learn from the tools and methods applied to identify, monitor, remove blockages and draw lessons to close equity gaps. Another major component of this forward-looking evaluation is an evaluability assessment which will support UNICEF in measuring its contribution and the results it supports in the medium term to reach the most disadvantaged children.

The evaluation includes seven in depth case studies (Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Indonesia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Zimbabwe) and twelve light touch studies (Uganda, Malawi, Zambia, Philippines, Peru, Haiti, Afghanistan, Nigeria, Senegal, Egypt, Georgia, Moldova). The final evaluation report is expected to be available in the second quarter of 2014 and will convey important lessons on how to better target the most vulnerable children and equity.

The evaluation of the **UNICEF-led global household Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) programme** that started in 2012 and was due to conclude in 2013 was significantly delayed but still met several milestones. It is divided into two clusters of topics. The cluster examining Round 4 efforts and Round 5 preparations with regard to technical issues of design, field implementation, data processing, and analysis yielded a final report that has been transmitted to the clients. The second cluster has been delayed by team member unavailability and low responsiveness of UNICEF staff. It is examining larger managerial issues of stability of funding, fit-for-purpose against various potential uses,
and the utilization of the data and reports once completed. It is expected to be completed in the first quarter of 2014.

**Result 6 - Central Level Evaluation Capacities:** Ensure that corporate level stakeholders can execute their Evaluation Policy-mandated technical and managerial accountabilities for discrete evaluations and for correlated planning, guidance, and utilization.

**Analysis of main results achieved:** The EO, the Office of Research (OoR), and the Statistics and Monitoring Section of the Division of Policy and Strategy met numerous times on issues of common interest. Key dialogues were held on demarcating areas of responsibility, how to deliver mutual support, and coordinating views when UNICEF needed a unified input from its key evidence-generating bodies.

Over the course of the year, the nascent partnership between the EO and the OoR grew in size, complexity, and trust to the point that it became a major part of EO’s total effort in this result area. In general, EO was a contributor to OoR-led activities, but many of these drew upon EO thinking and leadership. As of the end of 2013, the joint efforts - which often involve significant other partners - covered the following:

- The full final draft of a common taxonomy of research, monitoring and evaluation terms, which the OoR has finalized, is under review. Once completed, it will allow a common vocabulary to be used and will guide UNICEF’s issues of technical support, rigor, and quality expectations.
- The OoR issued a report on the ethics of research with children, including guidelines on internal processes that will help create first ever consistent ethics reviews. The EO was part of the reference group for this project.
- Discussions advanced on how to develop a corporate database for research. The optimal solution appears to be expanding the existing Evaluation Data Base, and design and managerial aspects are being discussed. It is likely that an expanded database will be activated in 2014.
- The EO is supporting the OoR to develop methods briefs on key designs and tools to conduct impact evaluations. These are being developed by an outside party based on UNICEF supplied designs and subject to UNICEF quality reviews.
- The OoR wants to establish quality assurance processes and norms for the conduct of research. As many such norms and processes exist within the evaluation function, a joint effort has been proposed by the EO.
- In combination with other interested parties, a discussion has begun on corporate positions on intellectual property. The desire is to protect UNICEF’s interests while removing the blockages that have kept academic units from bidding for UNICEFs research or evaluation contracts.

The collective result of these efforts is not yet visible since many are incomplete. But the potential is a radical upgrading of the tools, norms and processes affecting the collection and treatment of evidence by UNICEF, in a way that will improve consistency, reliability, ethics, and accessibility. Work will continue throughout 2014.

**A resource package on planning, monitoring and evaluation of child protection programmes** was completed under the lead of Child Protection Section, Programme Division to which EO collaborated with substantive inputs and quality assurance. The package was developed in response to several evaluations and reviews that have suggested need for systematic capacity building efforts for child protection programming. EO will be providing technical inputs in the launch and implementation of this much needed and timely initiative.
Shortfalls/constraints: The emergence of the detailed agenda with the OoR meant that other subjects were delayed or reduced in priority. Little action was taken on the M&E of innovations (now postponed to 2014 but made a priority within the evaluation plan) or on the revision of the evaluation content within the audit guidelines.

Result 7 - Systemic Strengthening of the Decentralized Evaluation Function: Continue to develop the capacities of field offices to meet their evaluation accountabilities and needs through a multi-initiative Global Compact between HQ and ROs.

Analysis of main results achieved: Most major activities planned for 2013 have been met. 2013 activities contributed to the results presented in three clusters below.

a. UNICEF decentralized evaluation function

The external review of the 2008 Evaluation Policy which included an examination of UNICEF’s decentralized structure had identified gaps and areas for improvement in the quality and coverage of evaluations, particularly at the decentralized level. In addition, evaluation planning needed to be strengthened and more closely linked to the organization’s strategic objectives. Provision of human and financial resources for evaluation also needed greater attention. Further, there is growing interest in strengthening the evaluation capacity of national partners. The revised Evaluation Policy (2013) seeks to address these issues and provide a framework for future improvements.

The EO continued to manage the Help Desk function and addressed in real time all queries from COs, ROs and HQ divisions. The intranet site, external website and the global evaluation community of practice (CoP) continued to be maintained in 2013, which ensured that information and knowledge were accessed easily and in a timely manner by all M&E staff and all UNICEF staff. The monthly newsletter, EvalNews, was systematically produced and disseminated to the evaluation community and wider audience who subscribe to the newsletter, which in turn kept the evaluation community updated on current issues, debates, methods, methodology, tools and general knowledge and information on evaluation. In 2013, more contributions were received from COs than in previous years which ensured a wider knowledge exchange and learning among M&E staff.

The consolidation and finalization of phase 2 work on the new evaluation database was completed and fully stabilized in 2013. This work included the addition of a search functionality (including free text search), a search functionality by language, the migration of 2012 GEROS results, which has contributed to a better and robust knowledge repository for UNICEF’s evaluation reports. A new management response tracking system was also developed and launched in 2013. This has ensured that both systems are on the same platform for consistency and easy access by all UNICEF staff. For the first time the management response tracking system was linked directly to the database to ensure stronger accountability and transparency of the records of what actions are planned in response to evaluations and what is actually done. This has been part of an initiative by the EO for greater efficiency and access to evaluation knowledge in a timely and efficient way.

Design and development work was completed on a new management software tool, the e-version of the Integrated M&E Plan. It will be piloted in 2014 in ESAR and then considered for expansion throughout UNICEF. All offices will enter their intended studies, surveys, research efforts and evaluations into the Sharepoint-platform e-IMEP. This will allow the identification of common interests, coordinated technical support, progress tracking, and oversight according to regional and
global standards. The design benefitted from the inputs of many stakeholders, and was brought to reality by the ICT division [Gia Santos, Siew Leo and team], who ensured integration with other UNICEF systems (e.g. VISION) and adherence to corporate quality standards. ESAR has made it mandatory for its 2014 IMEP plans, and will be the site for an in-depth pilot to identify problems and needed enhancements.

To enhance the oversight of the decentralized evaluation system, the **Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS)** introduced in 2010, includes individual feedback sent to each CO; in 2013 EO decided to start sending the feedback three languages (English, French and Spanish) to ensure equal access to the feedback, knowledge and learning from the quality reviews, and effective use of the knowledge and learning received from the feedback. The global dashboard which was mainstreamed into VISION has resulted in significant improvement in a number of areas:

- Submission of evaluation reports to the Global Evaluation Database reached an impressive 100% for all the regions in 2013 from a baseline of 20% in 2008.

- The **GEROS Global Meta-Evaluation Report 2013** found that the **quality of evaluation reports** has also seen a significant improvement with an increase from 42% in 2012 to 62% in 2013. The number of bad quality evaluation reports decreased significantly to 8% in 2013, from 23% in 2012. Evidence drawn from the 2013 and previous meta-analysis shows a positive trend towards improved report submissions and improved quality. Over half of 2012 evaluation reports met UNICEF’s quality standards (with a rating of highly satisfactory or outstanding), which represents a 20% increase from 2011 reports. This is a positive and significant rise in the overall quality of UNICEF’s evaluation reports and shows that GEROS has played a role in the continuous improvement of the overall quality as well as in the quality assurance of ToRs and draft evaluation reports at the regional and country levels.

- The submission and **implementation of management responses** has improved significantly. In 2013, the submission rate of management responses reached 89%, while the implementation rate of management responses reached 79% (actions completed and actions underway), this is a slight drop of 3% compared to 82% in 2012. Over the last two years, the EO has seen an increase in the submission and implementation rates of management response, due to continued management attention during the year, the global dashboard and the efforts by the EO to continue to follow up systematically with ROs and COs.

**b. Knowledge management (KM) and systems to support the evaluation function**

In 2013 the EO continued to position itself as a knowledge centre on country-led monitoring and evaluation to further strengthen national evaluation capacity from a knowledge perspective. The partnership between the EO, International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE) and other partners was further maintained in several ways:

- The IOCE-managed **MyM&E platform** to facilitate knowledge sharing and exchange on country-led M&E systems at a global scale was updated with learning resources identifying good practices and lessons learned.

- The **global community of practice** was further strengthened and in 2013 membership has grown significantly to 45,279 users, from 12,969 in 2012. The number of visitors has also risen
significantly from 222,266 in 2012 to 457,008 in 2013, with visitors from over 178 countries. Downloads have also increased from 910,717 pages in 2012 to 1,866,189 pages in 2013.

- **The second phase of e-learning** initiated in 2012 with 33 world-level keynote speakers was launched in 2013. The course was also launched in Spanish, Arabic and Russian, done in partnership with Red de Seguimiento, Evaluación y Sistematización en América Latina (ReLAC), MENA Evaluators Network (EvalMENA) and International Program Evaluation Network (IPEN). This has opened the e-learning up to a much wider international audience which has helped to develop stronger evaluation skills, especially at the national level. Users can for the first time customize their own e-learning course as well as learn at their own pace. This was implemented based on feedback received at the end of the first phase of the e-learning. Registered e-learning participants reached 20,457 in 2013 compared to 9,087 in 2012, which proves the success of the learning programme and the need for such learning programmes.

- An **internal e-learning programme**, specific to UNICEF was also launched during 2013. The objective this course is to strengthen the practical capabilities of UNICEF COs to manage effectively the evaluation function, with a special focus on major evaluations. The e-learning consists of four modules, related tests as well as a certification at the completion of the course. In addition M&E Specialists are also invited to submit and implement the Knowledge Application Plan (KAP) after the course to be able to receive an advanced certification.

These KM initiatives as well as the KM platform/system have continued to sustain the EO’s efforts in developing evaluation capacity at all levels, both internally among UNICEF M&E staff as well as externally, especially at the national level.

**c. National Evaluation Capacity Development**

EvalPartners, the major partnership initiative and global movement to strengthen the evaluation capacity of civil society, launched in 2012 by UNICEF and IOCE, was further strengthened during 2013 with a growing number of partners and activists; 47 partners and 65 activists from 38 countries joined the initiative in 2013, compared to 27 partners in 2012. 2015 has been declared as the ‘International Year of Evaluation’ (‘EvalYear’) by EvalPartners and many more partners/countries have expressed their interest in the declaration and have joined forces with EvalPartners.

EvalYear will position evaluation in the policy arena, by raising awareness of the importance of embedding monitoring and evaluation systems in the development and implementation of the forthcoming Sustainable Development Goals, and all other critical local contextualized goals. EvalYear is about taking mutual responsibility for policies and social action through greater understanding, transparency, and constructive dialogue.

In partnership with Claremont Evaluation Center, with the financial support of the Rockefeller Foundation, EvalPartners awarded 650 scholarships to support evaluators in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia, East and Central Europe to attend the 2013 online Professional Development Workshop Series on ‘Evaluation and Applied Research Methods’. This has been a significant undertaking in strengthening evaluation skills at the national level.

Several key publications were completed during the course of the year, including the development of an advocacy toolkit which was launched at the end of 2013 and two publications on civil society:
Stakeholder’s Perspectives on National Evaluation Capacity Development – this publication offers strong evidence of the way evaluation can contribute to ensure every human being has a right and obligation to exercise their right to a better life. The book also offers a number of important lessons learned, one of which is the power of a professional community in which there is free exchange of ideas and experiences and the way it promotes growth of individual, institutional and even national evaluation capacities.

Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs): learning from Africa, Americas, Asia, Australasia, Europe and Middle East – this publication breaks new ground and brings attention to the potential evaluation has to strengthen the capacity of civil society in social and economic development, policy and decision-making.

The VOPEs initiative which aims to influence policy makers, public opinion and other key stakeholders was successfully launched in 2013 with 37 VOPEs from six regions in peer-to-peer cooperation. This has contributed to further strengthening of VOPEs, enhancing their institutional and organizational capacity, leading to stronger and better management/conducting of credible evaluations for effective, equitable and gender responsive development results.
4. Management and Operations

Overall, management of EO resources has been satisfactory, with due attention to efficiency and risk. The existence of flexible funds allowed for the recruitment of two level 3 support professionals, and their presence helped ensure timely achievement of many items. Most staff took advantage of appropriate training opportunities, but no comprehensive training plan was prepared.

Increasing efficiency was emphasized in the year. The office continued the use of web seminars and other low cost connectivity options in support of capacity building efforts, global team building, and coordination with partners. The EO finalized the first set of instances using smaller evaluation teams and individual consultants that had been asked to work in a team. These instances (Horn of Africa Lessons Learning exercise; MICS Evaluation; PLAY review) appear to deliver acceptable quality at a lower cost. However, the staff time input does not shrink and there is an increased likelihood of delays if the workload is larger than estimated or team members need to be changed or are inefficient. This strategy will be carefully considered for the future. Well-managed competitive bidding practices (commended by the CRC) kept all evaluations within estimated budgets; the EO is considered a model office in this regard and was asked by Supply Division to co-facilitate a best practices procurement seminar. The EO conducted its part of the Effectiveness and Efficiency corporate exercise, and offered support to several of the governance bodies for the entire effort.

As noted earlier, the provision of supplemental funds allowed the start of some but not all scheduled global evaluations. The increased functionality of the OoR meant a key partner was fully present, leading to the good results in Intermediate Result 6 above. A consistent high-level of support was received from the IT Division that led to major advances in the management response data and a new platform for global M&E planning.

With respect to staffing, two senior evaluation professional posts are vacant at the end of December. One has been vacant since April 2013, and a recruitment process failed to generate a successful candidate. The second post has been vacant since November, and will be advertised in early 2014. This has led to reduced effort for some planned tasks, which is a cause for some of the shortfalls and constraints noted in the earlier sections.
5. Innovations and Lessons Learned

2013 saw a number of innovations that are summarized in Annex 1.
## 6. Studies, Surveys, Evaluations and Publications Completed in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sequence Number (Year /Seq. no)</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Recommended for Evaluation &amp; Research Database</th>
<th>Themes, keywords</th>
<th>Management Response Status</th>
<th>Evaluation Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic synthesis report on evaluation of humanitarian action</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/001</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Emergencies holistic or partnership</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Erica Mattellone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/002</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nutrition sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Evaluation of the UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C): Accelerating Change 2008-2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/004</td>
<td>Evaluation (Joint)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child protection sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>Joint MR Completed Annual implementation status updates to be completed 1 year after</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sequence Number (Year /Seq. no)</td>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td>Recommended for Evaluation &amp; Research Database</td>
<td>Themes, keywords</td>
<td>Management Response Status</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Evaluation UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C): Accelerating Change 2008-2012: Senegal Country Case Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/007</td>
<td>Evaluation (Joint)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child protection sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Evaluation UNFPA-UNICEF Joint Programme on Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C): Accelerating Change 2008-2012: Sudan Country Case Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/008</td>
<td>Evaluation (Joint)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child protection sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sequence Number (Year/Seq. no)</td>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td>Recommended for Evaluation &amp; Research Database</td>
<td>Themes, keywords</td>
<td>Management Response Status</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluability Assessment of the Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme (PBEA)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/005</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other-Emergencies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Kathleen Letshabo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies: Colombia Country Case Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/001</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child protection sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies: Democratic Republic of Congo Country Case Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/001</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child protection sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies: Pakistan Country Case Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/001</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child protection sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sequence Number (Year /Seq. no)</td>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td>Recommended for Evaluation &amp; Research Database</td>
<td>Themes, keywords</td>
<td>Management Response Status</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies: South Sudan Country Case Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/005</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child protection sectoral or partnership</td>
<td>Eval</td>
<td>Krishna Belbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Evaluation of Joint Gender Programmes in the UN System</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2013/009</td>
<td>Evaluation (Joint)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gender-Equity</td>
<td>Awaiting MR</td>
<td>Mathew Varghese/ Laurence Reichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Global Evaluation of Emergency Response Funds (ERFs) – Final Report</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012/014</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other-Emergencies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Erica Mattellone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Fast Track Recruitment Process (FTRP)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012/015</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other-Emergencies</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Erica Mattellone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1. Innovations and Lessons Learned

Innovations

MTSP Focus Area: ☑

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FA1</th>
<th>FA2</th>
<th>FA3</th>
<th>FA4</th>
<th>FA5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross Cutting Strategy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>C4D</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>KM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key themes Evaluation, Humanitarian, Capacity Development

Title: E-Learning on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action

Contact Person: Name and email: Erica Mattellone, emattellone@unicef.org

Abstract

Present the content of the recent ALNAP Guide on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action, supported by UNICEF, in an e-learning course that will be hosted on the EvalPartners website.

Issue/Background

There are no e-learning courses on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action, and there is a growing need to develop capacity in evaluating humanitarian action at the decentralized level in UNICEF.

Strategy and Implementation

The e-learning is developed by UNICEF in partnership with ALNAP and EvalPartners. UNICEF is supporting the production of the technical component of the e-learning and the content together with ALNAP. The e-learning will be launched in 2014 on the EvalPartners website, providing evaluation professionals, both humanitarian and development, access to free evaluation capacity development materials and the ability to learn from their peers through a community of practice.

Progress and Results

As of December 2013, UNICEF and ALNAP have formulated a plan to implement the e-learning in 2014, and UNICEF has contracted to DevInfo the production of the technical component of the programme.

Innovation

This first e-learning course on Evaluation of Humanitarian Action is intended to fill a major gap in humanitarian evaluation capacity, providing access to free educational material to professionals.

Potential application

This course could be in a second phase translated in other languages, in addition to English, to further expand its potential. The same approach could be used to cover in greater depth other specific areas of evaluation of humanitarian action, for instance, real-time evaluation, accountability to affected populations.

Next Steps

The following steps in the implementation strategy include the production of the content of the programme, the testing of the e-learning and the launch in 2014.