

Annual Report on the evaluation function

Evaluation Office UNICEF

Presentation to informal session of the
UNICEF Executive Board

13 May 2014

System wide UN evaluation coherence

These activities fall mainly into three areas:

1. **The QCPR:** has influenced the UNICEF evaluation policy and UN thinking on an independent evaluation entity
2. **Inter-agency and joint evaluations and related initiatives**
 - a. Joint Gender Programmes
 - b. FGM/C
3. **Overall leadership and governance processes** - mainly conducted through the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC).

National evaluation capacity development

- **Global partnership to enhance evaluation capacities:** including establishment of **EvalPartners** that now includes >50 partners and 34 national evaluation associations.
- **Global learning, including global learning platform ‘MyM&E’:** with almost 460,000 visitors in 2013; and an e-learning programme on development evaluation, taught by 33 world-level speakers, enrolling some 20,000 persons in 2013
- **Strengthening the evaluation of humanitarian action:** with ALNAP partners, UNICEF has helped develop a Pilot Guide for the Evaluation of Humanitarian Action (2013) and an e-learning course.

UNICEFs Evaluation Function: An External Review

A review of UNICEF's development effectiveness was performed by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs on behalf of OECD-DAC, based on UNICEF evaluations completed in 2009-2011

Main Findings:

- + The UNICEF ratings of evaluation quality can be trusted.
- "The lack of clear results frameworks and appropriate indicators and baseline information were factors that detracted from UNICEF's effective use of monitoring and evaluation systems."
- Inadequate evaluation coverage in countries with the largest funding.
- Gender was adequately addressed in only two thirds of the evaluations sampled.
- "Efficiency is not covered systematically in all evaluations,"
- + UNICEF invests considerable effort in results monitoring systems
- + UNICEF uses the results of global evaluations for strategic planning

Indicator 4: Quality of UNICEF evaluations

	2009	2011	2012
Quality rating			
Confident to act (good or excellent)	36	42	62
Almost confident to act (almost satisfactory)	34	35	30
Poor	30	23	8

Corporate emphases: issues specifically examined within the overall ratings	Percentage of reports attaining a 'good' or 'excellent' rating		
	2010	2011	2012
Appropriate incorporation of human rights, gender and equity concerns	18	33	44
Engagement of all stakeholders in ways suited to their capacities and interests	40	52	48

Indicator 5: Use of evaluation, including management responses

Submission of management responses to the Global Tracking System:

- 2009 (baseline): 10%
- 2011: 93%
- 2012: 90% 

Implementation of management response commitments:

- 2010 (baseline): 62%
- 2011: 82%
- 2012: 79% 

Indicator 6: Corporate-level evaluations

Plan status	2010-2011		2012-2013	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Scheduled	15	–	14	–
Completed [At end 1 st Q of year following bi-ennium]	10	67	7	50
Under implementation	3	20	1	7
Rescheduled	0	–	6	43
Cancelled	2	13	0	–

Implementation of Corporate Evaluations: Additional major activities

- An evaluation synthesis paper on UNICEF humanitarian action [2013] and on nutrition [2014],
- The joint evaluations described in section III;
- A global thematic synthesis report on the approach to community management of acute malnutrition;
- An assessment of the evaluability of the programme on peacebuilding, education and advocacy in conflict-affected contexts

Support for evaluations of humanitarian action, including:

- The review of the fast-track recruitment policy;
- The real-time evaluation of the UNICEF response to the Mali crisis;
- The OCHA-led evaluation of the emergency response fund.

The evaluation function in UNICEF: human resources

	3/2008	12/2011	12/2013	Growth 2011-2013
International evaluation professionals at level 3 or above	50	73	95	+30%
National evaluation professionals at level 3 or above	40	41	63	+54%
Evaluation professionals at level 3 or above (total)	90	114	158	+39%
Evaluation professionals at level 1 or 2	NR	NR	90	–
Percentage of evaluation professionals in field offices	84%	89%	90%	+1%
Percentage of female evaluation professionals at level 3 or above	42%	44%	50%	+6%
Percentage of female evaluation professionals at levels 1-2	NR	NR	40%	–

Strengthening UNICEF's evaluation system: the regional link

Broad conclusions:

- **The decentralized structure of UNICEF – with support from headquarters and a guiding corporate policy – remains well adapted to generating, sharing and using effective evaluation practice at the regional level.**
- **Given limited staff and budgets, the range and complexity of evaluation efforts led by regional offices is substantial**
- **The diversity of approaches and emphases also presents an opportunity for sharing among regions. This opportunity is being realized**

Exemplary adaptations to regional contexts

Region	Example 1	Example 2
EAPR	Creation of full time level 5 regional office evaluation post	Developing standards to certify evaluation professionals
South Asia	Develop regional centers of tech support excellence to reduce dependence on North	Inter-agency support: training M&E focal points within UN Country Teams
MENA	Evaluation performance scorecard	Partnering with Laval U (Canada) on policy impact analysis
ESAR	Regional thematic evaluations on humanitarian themes	Support COs to set up evaluation and research committees
CEE-CIS	TOR quality review for human rights, gender, equity	RD led regional evaluation management committee
WCAR	4 year evaluation strategy	CO M&E officers acting as peer reviewers for other offices

Thank you for your attention