DAC/UNEG Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of UNICEF

Terms of Reference

Introduction

1.   The OECD-DAC Network on Development Evaluation (EvalNet) and the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) maintain a Joint Task Force to support professional Peer Reviews of the evaluation function of UN organizations. Each Peer Review is intended to identify good practice and opportunities to further strengthen the evaluation function in the agency under review, with a view to contributing ultimately to improved performance in international development cooperation and humanitarian assistance[1]. Sixteen Peer Reviews have been conducted to date.

2.   A DAC-UNEG Peer Review of the evaluation function at the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was conducted in 2006[2]. Since then, many changes have occurred both within UNICEF and in the external environment. The 2006 Peer Review was followed by preparation of a comprehensive evaluation policy, approved by the UNICEF Executive Board in 2008. In 2013, the Executive Board approved a Revised Evaluation Policy[3], which requires UNICEF to undertake a peer review of the implementation of the evaluation policy, a requirement recently reiterated by the UNICEF Executive Board. Through the Joint Task Force, a Panel of professional evaluation peers has been assembled to conduct the Peer Review, with support from a consultant adviser (see Annexe A).

3.   The independent peer review of UNICEF's evaluation function will assess the status and performance of the evaluation function, considering in particular to what extent it is fit for purpose, influential with key stakeholders (internal and external) and matched to UNICEF's evolving approach and organization as proposed in its Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The Peer Review will be conducted in line with the UNEG Peer Review framework,[4] which lays emphasis on three important principles: the independence, credibility, and usefulness of the evaluation function. UNEG recently revised its overall framework of norms and standards for evaluation[5] and this will provide a key reference point for the peer review. The peer review is intended to be forward-looking, providing guidance on how the evaluation function can be further strengthened to meet emerging challenges and opportunities both within the UN system and more broadly.

4.   The primary audiences for the Peer Review are UNICEF Senior Management and the Executive Board, as well as the staff of the Evaluation Office and more widely across the organisation. The Peer Review report will be presented to the Executive Director and the Executive Board and made publicly available through the Web site of UNICEF Evaluation Office. The executive

---

[1] See UNEG, 2011, *UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of the Evaluation Function of UN organizations,* UNEG/REF(2011)1

[2] *Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), May 2006*. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/98

[3] UNICEF: http://www.uneval.org/document/download/2428

[4] *UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews of Evaluation Function of UN Organizations,* approved by the Annual General Meeting of the UN Evaluation Group in 2011.

[5] UNEG: *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*, June 2016. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914

summary of the report will be prepared as a stand-alone text to help inform key external stakeholders such as implementing partners, major donors, and the broader evaluation community of the main findings and conclusions of the review.

5.   The Peer Review will also be presented to the members of UNEG and the DAC Evaluation Network for information and feedback on issues of evaluation quality and utility and the Peer Review Panel will provide feedback on the process to the DAC-UNEG Joint Task Force on Peer Reviews to contribute to the further development of the peer review instrument.

6.   This document sets out the Terms of Reference for the Peer Review of the evaluation function of UNICEF. It describes the background and rationale for the Peer Review, its purpose, the scope, the general approach, the methods, the time schedule and funding arrangements. A draft version of the document was revised and commented upon by the Peer Review Panel and shared with UNICEF Management.

Background

7.   The last DAC-UNEG Peer Review of UNICEF's Evaluation Function was conducted in 2006. Recommendations included; the need to develop a revised evaluation policy, presentation of costed evaluation work plans and evaluation recommendation compliance reports to the Executive Board, improving the clarity of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities vis-à-vis evaluation at the central, regional and country levels, strengthening aspects of evaluation selection (coverage) and quality assurance.

8.   In the intervening decade, many changes have taken place within UNICEF and in the external environment, and further changes are anticipated in the period of the next Strategic Plan 2018-2021. A follow up peer review is therefore timely.

9.   Some of the significant changes that have occurred since the last peer review within UNICEF's evaluation function include:

a) **Evaluation expenditure** has been steadily increasing, both in absolute terms and as percentage of programme budget. In 2016, UNICEF spent USD 35.5 million on evaluation across HQ units, regional and country offices which represents 0.7% of programme budget (up from 0.33% in 2011 and 0.5% in 2014 but still below the 1% target set out in the policy).

b) The number of **human resources** with "evaluation" in their job titles has levelled off around the 300 mark in the current strategic plan period (2013-2017). Within this number, the share of single-function staff has increased as has staff seniority, with 184 staff at level 3 or above in 2015 (compared to 158 in 2013 and 90 in 2008). At the central Evaluation Office, more sectoral specialists have been hired in recent years.

c) In terms of **evaluation coverage**, about three quarters of UNICEF field offices have completed at least one evaluation report in the 3 year period 2014-2016, leaving some 30-35 countries without coverage. In 2016, the central Evaluation Office published 9 evaluations and the decentralized function has produced about 90 reports. While the number of evaluations produced by the EO has been fairly stable, country and regional offices have completed fewer evaluations during the current strategic plan period that focused on higher-level results (i.e., at the outcome or impact levels). In 2013 and prior,

100+ mainly project/programme evaluations were published annually by UNICEF's decentralized evaluation function.

d) **Evaluation quality** has steadily improved in recent years. 77% of evaluations conducted in 2016 and quality-rated to date by external reviewers were considered good or excellent, as compared with 74% in 2014, 62% in 2012 and 36% in 2009.

10.   Some of the significant organizational changes within UNICEF relating to the evaluation function can be listed as follows:

- Approval of the first UNICEF Evaluation Policy (2008). This followed up on the 2006 Peer Review. An Executive Directive followed, providing guidance on strengthening the evaluation function in line with the UNICEF Evaluation Policy.
- Arrival of the current UNICEF Executive Director and an organizational refocus on equity for children (2010). The refocus on equity was accompanied by development of the Monitoring Results for Equity System (MoRES). In parallel, the Evaluation Office issued guidance on "How to design and manage equity-focused evaluations".
- Arrival of the current Director of the UNICEF Evaluation Office (2011)
- Review of the UNICEF Evaluation Function (2012). Conducted by external consultants, this review provided a snapshot of the status of the evaluation function and provided an informed basis for preparation of the Revised Evaluation Policy.
- Approval of the Revised Evaluation Policy (2013). The revised policy updated the previous evaluation policy. Inter alia, it provided, for the first time, a target for expenditure on evaluation.
- Approval of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (2013).
- Publication of the first Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations 2014-2017 (2013; updated and revised in 2015). The Plan for Global Thematic Evaluations – i.e. corporate level evaluations produced by the Evaluation Office – reflected the main outcome areas set out in the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The Plan continues to guide the choice of evaluation topics addressed by the Evaluation Office.
- Establishment of the Field Results Group (2014). Under a newly-established Deputy Executive Director post, the Field Results Group reinforced the focus on results and on performance monitoring in the field. While increasing the results orientation, it also gave additional responsibilities to monitoring and evaluation staff in regional and country offices.
- JIU review: "Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system" (see A/70/686) (2014). This landmark review found the evaluation function in UNICEF to be "above average and high", transitioning to the highest level of organizational maturity but with some issues requiring attention.
- UNGA Resolution on "Building capacity for evaluation of development activities at the country level" (see A/C.2/69/L.35) (2014). UNICEF is one of a handful of UN agencies giving attention to building country capacity for evaluation. The UN Resolution provided support for this aspect of the organization's work
- Internal reviews of (a) the GEROS quality assurance system and (b) the evaluation management response system (2015). The reviews were undertaken to identify

opportunities to further strengthen these key elements of the UNICEF evaluation function. Steps are being taken to address the recommendations of these reviews.

- Approval of the UNICEF Policy on Research Policy (2016). Collaboration between the "evidence functions" of evaluation, research and data collection and analysis has been an evolving aspect of UNICEF's approach, and includes the development of shared systems and activities.

- Self-assessment of the UNICEF evaluation function (2016). The self-assessment was designed to follow up the review undertaken in 2012, and to provide evidence and information for the scheduled external peer review. Overall, the results confirmed the view that the evaluation function was generally strong overall but with a number of issues in need of systematic attention.

11.   The external landscape has also evolved greatly since 2006. Fundamental issues regarding international development are being widely debated and discussed, including the role and organization of the UN system, the framing of the Agenda 2030 global sustainable development goals and stronger leadership by countries of their development processes. There is increasing recognition of the need for innovative financing mechanisms to support the SDG agenda including a stronger role for private sector, impact investing and philanthropy. Whilst, in addition, the greater urgency of migration will have profound effects on UNICEF's target populations. These discussions carry implications for evaluation in the UN, for example more emphasis on country-led evaluation, joint evaluation and arrangements for UN system-wide evaluation. In 2014, the UN General Assembly endorsed a Resolution (see A/C.2/69/L.35) calling for support to strengthen national evaluation systems.

12.   In the humanitarian field, the international architecture is changing, most recently in terms of commitments proposed at the World Humanitarian Summit. Also, the intensification and multiplication of complex emergencies present considerable evaluation challenges, such as joint or co-ordinated inter-agency evaluations of Level 3 emergencies.

13.   Increased attention is being given to evaluation of cross cutting themes such as equity, gender equality, environment, climate change, resilience and urbanization. Meanwhile, in a context of reduced resources, there is demand for greater attention to issues of efficiency and value for money.

14.   The field of evaluation is itself at a crossroads more generally with pressures from within and externally to become more relevant to ever more rapid cycles of decision making. It must make better use of rapidly available digital and mobile data, adopt new ways of visualizing and transmitting information and promote new ways of learning in a digital age. Evaluation must adjust to the rise and importance of monitoring, learning at scale (scaling up), the challenges of using 'big data', whilst acknowledging a resurgence of interest in participatory methods, data ownership, voice and agency for stakeholders and beneficiaries. Alongside these new dynamics discussions on evaluation focus, methodological choices and methodological rigour have continued and evaluators now grapple with technical and conceptual challenges of real-time evaluation, impact evaluation, evaluation of normative work, evaluation in complex settings, contribution analysis, evaluation of humanitarian principles and assessment of value for money.

15.   All of these factors may have major implications for the way UNICEF's evaluation function and leadership should evolve and position itself going forward.

Purpose of the Peer Review

16.   An independent Peer Review will help UNICEF to consider steps required to further strengthen its evaluation function so that it is fully fit for purpose and well-placed to make the best contribution to the work and strategic positioning of the organization whilst furthering developments in the field of evaluation.

17.   In line with this goal, the Peer Review will undertake an assessment of the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function at UNICEF, focusing on 1) the independence and credibility of the function; 2) the quality, use and follow up of evaluations across the organization to promote accountability, learning, and improvement; 3) the leadership, and vision shown by UNICEF's evaluation function, including its capacity to adjust to the changing environment.

18.   It will provide recommendations to the Executive Director, the Executive Board and the Evaluation Office aimed at improving the quality of the evaluation function generally, and specifically to inform discussions and decisions about the role, positioning, leadership, vision, resourcing (including capacity) and mandate of the UNICEF Office of Evaluation as well as arrangements for evaluation at decentralized levels.

Subject, Scope, and Limitations

19.   The Peer Review will assess both the strategic positioning of evaluation in UNICEF as well as its functioning at an operational level, including the analysis of those factors affecting the quality, credibility and usefulness of evaluations.

20.   The DAC-UNEG Peer Review follows an agreed framework with a blend of standardized and flexible elements to reflect the diversity of UN organizations and their respective evaluation arrangements. UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential. The Peer Review Panel will keep the organization's distinct mission and mandate, both in relation to humanitarian and development interventions, in view throughout.

21.   The core assessment question is: "Are the agency's evaluation policy, function and its products: independent; credible; useful and influential for learning and accountability purposes, as assessed by a Panel of professional evaluation peers against the UN Norms and Standards and the evidence base?"[6]

22.   The Revised Evaluation Policy (2013) will be the baseline reference for the Peer Review, although a brief review of developments since the 2006 Peer Review will provide useful background. Using the three criteria of independence, credibility and utility, the Peer Review Panel will focus on the adequacy of the present Evaluation Policy, on the efforts made for its implementation and on the central and decentralized evaluation arrangements in the light of UNICEF's corporate objectives and organizational structure. Based on the evidence canvassed and analysed, the Panel will submit recommendations to strengthen the UNICEF evaluation function overall.

23.   The Peer Review Panel will examine and comment on both operational and strategic issues including:

---

[6] UNEG, 2011, UNEG Framework for Professional Peer Reviews in the Evaluation Function of UN organizations, UNEG/REF(2011)/1

A. The EVALUATION POLICY of UNICEF, in particular:

    a. the extent to which the evaluation policy conforms with UNEG Norms and Standards, internal and external contextual changes and whether it needs to be updated;

    b. how well-aligned is the UNICEF evaluation policy with other organisational policies or frameworks relevant to the evaluation function (notably, those concerning strategic planning and budgeting; results-based management and monitoring; research, data collection and analysis and knowledge management; and human resources management);

    c. whether the policy includes and safeguards adequate provision of human and financial resources for evaluation at (a) central level and (b) decentralized levels; and whether it sets out clear arrangements for maintaining and updating technical skills and knowledge for evaluation within UNICEF;

    d. how far the policy sets out clear functional and organizational arrangements to ensure that evaluation, both at central and decentralized level, contributes effectively to learning, accountability and performance improvement within UNICEF;

    e. how far the policy sets out clear principles concerning harmonization and alignment of evaluation activities as well as partnerships for evaluation to promote evaluation use, influence and 'learning at scale'.

B. GOVERNANCE arrangements, including the following:

    f. the organizational and functional relationships of the Evaluation Office with Management and the Executive Board of UNICEF;

    g. mechanisms to protect financial and human resources for evaluation from influence which might undermine the independence and impartiality of both centralised and decentralised evaluation work, at all levels (noting also the appropriateness of any de-facto mechanisms);

    h. arrangements for oversight of self-evaluation and decentralized evaluation activities;

    i. contractual arrangements for the post of Director of Evaluation, including recruitment, performance management and termination;

    j. mechanisms (both formal and informal) to provide the Director of Evaluation with adequate access and opportunities to contribute to key corporate processes and decisions, including the deliberations of the UNICEF Executive Board and safeguards in place to avoid conflict of interests between contribution to decision-making and later evaluations;

    k. arrangements for periodic review of the evaluation function;

    l. arrangements for the oversight and quality control of the decentralized evaluation function.

C. MANAGEMENT of the Evaluation Office, focusing on the following:

- Operational management

    m. how far management arrangements, working procedures and the internal organization of the Office supports the fulfilment of evaluation policy commitments and the achievement of strategic evaluation objectives;

n. approaches used to plan and manage evaluations and follow up, including arrangements to manage the quality and duration of the evaluation process;

o. the development, provision and use of guidance, methods and tools to support and strengthen management of evaluations at central and decentralized levels;

p. how far the office provides effective oversight of the evaluation function and provides satisfactory reporting on evaluation performance across the organization.

- Leadership and vision.

q. the extent to which UNICEF Evaluation leaders and managers are seen as influential internally in the agency at headquarters and regionally/nationally – and how they can become more so;

r. how well UNICEF Evaluation embraces and integrates, new technologies in data collection and analysis, new thinking in innovation, trends and dynamics in evaluation in development, and the use of evidence more broadly at a meta level, beyond individual evaluations

D. EVALUATION PLANNING, including consideration of the following:

s. the methods and criteria used for strategic planning and prioritization of evaluation activities at all levels[7] and the extent to which topics selected for evaluation meet the needs and demands of UNICEF's key stakeholders, balancing accountability including on coverage, and learning;

t. how far topics selected reflect the strategic directions and concerns of the organization as well as the UN system and the wider humanitarian system. Particular attention will be given not only to the evaluation focus on children and young people, but also to emerging issues including challenges around the sustainable development goals, issues of innovation and new technologies, as well as cross cutting issues relating to equity and gender equality;

u. the balance of effort between corporate, joint and system-wide evaluation work;

v. the planning of decentralized evaluation activities;

w. the balance of effort between undertaking new evaluations and synthesising and disseminating existing findings and lessons.

E. EVALUATION QUALITY at each level of the organization, including attention to the following:

x. the quality and credibility of the evaluations, from the planning process through the conduct of the evaluations to the quality of the evaluation reports and of evaluation results);

y. the extent to which UNICEF evaluations integrate Human Rights and Gender Equality and Empowerment principles;

z. the independence of evaluation teams and team leaders;

---

[7] E.g (i) the use of trends scanning, and scoping of external context to inform what should be evaluated (ii) the use of external advisors in new areas of challenge to enhance evaluation methods and processes

aa.   ways in which the credibility and utility of the reports are enhanced, including how stakeholders are facilitated to comment on draft reports;

bb.   the adequacy of the quality assurance system;

cc.   the use of external quality reviewers, advisory panels etc.;

F. EVALUATION FOLLOW UP AND USE. Important aspects include the following:

dd.   the absorptive capacity of the organization, arrangements for managing evaluation results in terms of arrangements for knowledge management (including internal and external web presence);

ee.   the use of evaluation evidence in the development of new policies and programmes and in decision-making, to the extent that this can be assessed;

ff.   more widely, the impact of the evaluations, to the extent this can be assessed, including their influence in supporting learning, enhancing accountability and organizational improvement at the relevant levels;

gg.   the ways in which evaluation results are communicated and lessons used both within UNICEF and by others (such as member countries, donors, and cooperating partners);

hh.   similarly, the ways in which the results of joint evaluations and system wide evaluations are communicated and the lessons used by UNICEF staff and other stakeholders;

ii.   responsibilities for the follow-up of lessons and recommendations, including arrangements for preparation and implementation of a formal Management Response;

jj.   how follow-up is undertaken, monitored and accountabilities discharged;

kk.   the clarity and relevance of recommendations and how well management implements decisions based on evaluation recommendations in developing organisational policy, strategy and programming;

G. EXTERNAL INFLUENCE, PARTNERSHIPS AND POSITIONING. Engagement with, and influence on, external stakeholders including national partners, donors, NGO partners, and the global development/humanitarian evaluation community, including UNEG;

ll.   The balance of effort between partnership activities (including participation in relevant networks, conferences and support for national evaluation capacity development) and other priorities set out in the evaluation policy.

mm.   How well does the UNICEF evaluation function support the capacity and skills of its stakeholders to use the results of evaluations for improved policies and programs.

nn.   How well does the UNICEF evaluation function communicate for influence, knowledge building, learning. How effectively does it promote the use of evidence and knowledge in development decisions and empowering stakeholders both internally and externally.

24.   By necessity, a professional Peer Review of the evaluation function is not a full-fledged evaluation that can comprehensively evaluate practices, processes, and outcomes in depth. The Panel will report on the limitations of its work.

Core Assessment Criteria

25.   As noted above, the Peer Review will apply three core criteria that need to be satisfied for evaluation functions and products to be considered of high quality:

26.   <u>Independence of evaluations and the evaluation system(s).</u> The independence of the evaluation function comprises two key aspects — behavioural independence and organizational independence.

- Behavioural independence entails the ability to evaluate impartially without undue influence by any party. This requires that the persons and entities undertaking the evaluation should be independent of those concerned with the policy, programme or activities to be evaluated, to avoid possible bias or conflicts of interest. Evaluators must have the full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially, without the risk of negative effects on their career development, and must be able to freely express their assessment.

- Organizational independence requires that the central evaluation function is positioned independently from management functions, carries the responsibility of setting the evaluation agenda and is provided with adequate resources to conduct its work. At the same time, in practice, the guarantees of independence are necessarily defined according to the nature of evaluation work, its governance and decision-making arrangements, and other factors. In this regard, the activities of the Evaluation Office can be expected to have greater degree of independence than evaluation activities at decentralized levels. Organizational independence also necessitates that evaluation managers have full discretion to directly submit evaluation reports to the appropriate level of decision-making and that they should report directly to an organization's governing body and/or the executive head. Independence is vested in the Evaluation Head to directly commission, produce, publish and disseminate duly quality-assured evaluation reports in the public domain without undue influence by any party.

27.   <u>Credibility of evaluations.</u> Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements that contribute to credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Credibility requires that evaluations are ethically conducted, managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competencies, and should report successes, as well as failures. Recipient partners should, as a rule, fully participate in evaluations in order to promote credibility and commitment on their side. Whether and how the organization's approach to evaluation fosters partnership and helps builds ownership merits close attention.

28.   <u>Utility of evaluations.</u> In commissioning and conducting an evaluation, there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is evident when it contributes in an effective and timely manner to organizational learning, accountability for results and informed decision-making processes. To have an impact on decision-making, evaluation findings must be perceived as credible, and relevant and be presented in a clear and concise way. They should also respond to the different interests and needs of the many parties involved in the evaluation subject. However, measures to ensure the utility of evaluations are only partly under the control of evaluators. It is also critically a function of the interest of managers and member countries through their participation on governing bodies and in commissioning, receiving, and using evaluations. Evaluations may also contribute to knowledge as

a public good, when agencies and organizations join together in creating 'linked up knowledge' and a common understanding of what works and what does not. Whilst no one organization can do this on their own, the Peer Review Panel will assess the role and contributions of the UNICEF evaluation function.

29.   The core criteria of impartiality and transparency will also be considered, as they are strongly related to the criteria of independence, credibility and utility. Impartiality is enabled by independence and is a fundamental element of the credibility of evaluations. Transparency is another fundamental element of credibility and is an important basis for the utility of evaluations[8].

Approach, methods and tools

30.   The UNICEF Evaluation Office is undertaking a self-assessment against UNEG norms and standards and results will be shared with the Panel. The framework for the self-assessment will be consistent with the ToR for the Peer Review and the evaluation framework that will be developed accordingly. This will be supplemented by further information to be assembled by the Panel's consultant advisor/s, based on a review of relevant documentation, interviews, round table discussions. The consultant advisor/s will also undertake a quality review of a sample of evaluation reports, which will include reports produced by the Evaluation Office and from decentralized evaluations. To assess the quality of evaluation reports, the Peer Review will use UNICEF's GEROS quality assessment tool, or adapt it to ensure consistency with UNEG and OECD/DAC quality criteria.. The consultant/s will also undertake a preliminary visit to discuss with the UNICEF Evaluation Office staff and gather relevant documentation. These activities will provide the basis for a preliminary assessment.

31.   Equipped with the preliminary assessment, members of the Peer Panel will conduct an initial visit in March 2017. This will include a round of meetings, interviews and focus group discussions with UNICEF staff, senior management and members of the Executive Board and key UNICEF external stakeholders. The Panel will also have the opportunity to inform Board members about the approach of the Peer Review and progress made. On the basis of these consultations, the Panel will prepare a draft report.

32.   Field visits by Panel members and the consultant team will be conducted with key UNICEF stakeholders. These will likely be 'opportunistic' visits undertaken by Panel members who may visit Regional and country offices for other professional tasks. The Panel will also seek opportunities to interact with field-based staff remotely and through existing networks in which UNICEF plays a key role (such as AfrEA, South Asia Conclave, CLEAR, etc.).

33.   A second Peer Review visit, proposed for May-June 2017, will present a draft report for discussion. Consultations will be held with members of the Executive Board and representatives of UNICEF management, most likely through a meeting of the internal UNICEF Evaluation Committee. A "peer exchange" session will also be arranged to allow a professional exchange of perspectives between the Panel, the Evaluation Office and other UNICEF stakeholders closely involved in evaluation. Reflecting on feedback received, the Panel will prepare a final report, including findings, conclusions and recommendations for further strengthening the evaluation function at UNICEF.

Reporting

---

[8] See UNEG: *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*, June 2016. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914

34.   The final report of the Peer Review will present an overview of the evaluation function at UNICEF and key findings relating to its independence, credibility and utility, leadership and vision. The report will present conclusions and recommendations for action. The report will be a maximum of 50 pages in length, supplemented by an executive summary and annexes. The Executive Summary will be made available to key implementing partners and stakeholders, particularly to those consulted in the course of the peer review.

35.   The Panel Chair will submit the report of the Panel to the Executive Board through the Evaluation Office. It is expected that Management would submit a formal Management Response at the same session.

36.   The final report will also be provided to the joint DAC-UNEG Task Force, for dissemination among its respective constituencies and to interested cooperating partners. The Peer Panel will report on the Review's progress to UNICEF Evaluation Office and the joint DAC/UNEG Task Force and will provide the DAC-UNEG Task Force with feedback on the experience of the Peer Review to enable the members of UNEG and DAC evaluation network, to learn from experience at UNICEF and further strengthen the peer review mechanism.

Responsibility of the UNICEF Evaluation Office

37.   The UNICEF Evaluation Office serves as the main contact point within UNICEF for the Panel and its advisors. The Evaluation Office will provide requested information and data, including the following:

- Names and details of contact persons whom the Panel or its advisors wish to contact;
- Complete list of the UNICEF evaluations (2013-present);
- List of persons to meet in UNICEF Management and in the Executive Board;
- List of key implementing partners in regions
- Contact info of consultant evaluation team leaders, on request;
- E-library of evaluation products accessible via Internet.
- Organigram of UNICEF showing the position of Evaluation and UNICEF decision-makers.
- Documents outlining the leadership role that UNICEF plays in the UN system and in the broader development and evaluation fields.

38.   The Office will provide the Panel with a self-assessment prior to the start of the Peer Review. The Office will brief UNICEF and its Executive Board about the Peer Review. The Office will also submit the Panel's report and recommendations to the Executive Director and to the Executive Board.

39.   The budget for the Peer Review will be funded primarily by the UNICEF Evaluation Office (see section on Resources below).

Documents to be consulted (not exhaustive)

- UNEG/DAC Peer review (2006)
- 2012 review of the evaluation function
- All evaluation reports from across UNICEF (2013 - present)
- Guidelines, templates, and other evaluation tools as published by the Evaluation Office or other units

- Other relevant UNICEF documents including, as well as documents concerning RBM, monitoring, operational procedures, and risk management.
- Evaluation Policy, both 2008 and 2013 versions
- UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017

Persons to meet (by advisors and/or Peer Panel Members)

- UNICEF Evaluation Office Director and Staff
- The Executive Director (or his representative) and senior staff in UNICEF, including Regional Directors
- UNICEF Staff dealing with results-based management, knowledge systems, programme appraisal, management response on evaluations, good practices and portfolio quality improvement, as well as risk management and internal audit;
- Former evaluation consultant team leaders
- Staff members of a selected number of UNICEF units, including technical departments
- Staff members in regional, sub-regional, and country offices to be interviewed through teleconferencing or Skype
- Members of the UNICEF Board
- Representative of UNICEF Partners

Review Process and Schedule

40.   Peer Review activities will begin in November 2016; a preparatory information gathering phase will take place between December and February 2017, while the Peer Review Panel will undertake formal visits to UNICEF HQ in March 2017, and provide a final report for presentation to the Executive Board in September 2017.

41.   The Peer Review process has 6 main phases *(indicative timing is shown in brackets)*:

1. Preparation (October 2016): Mobilization of the Panel.
2. Fact-finding (December 2016-February 2017): the Evaluation Office will undertake a self-assessment. The consultant team will undertake extensive document review, may carry out a visit to UNICEF for consultations with EO and prepare a preliminary assessment. This will be discussed by Evaluation Office and Panel members (via videoconference).
3. First visit by the Panel to UNICEF HQ (March 2017); interviews with selected staff of relevant UNICEF units and Senior Management; analysis and triangulation of findings; preparation of draft report.
4. Field visits (tbc) (January-April)
5. Peer Exchange (September 2017): Second visit of Panel to UNICEF HQ for peer exchange; further consultations; presentation of key findings and conclusions to Senior Management and Executive Board members; preparation of final report, incorporating feedback from Senior Management and the Executive Board.
6. Presentation of Final Report (September 2017): at Executive Board session.

Resources

42.   The costs of the Peer Review will be covered as follows:

- The participation of the Panel members will be covered by their own organizations, or by UNEG resources.
- The costs of hiring consultant advisors will be covered by the Peer Review budget.
- The costs of external stakeholder consultations will be covered by the Peer Review budget, where appropriate
- Costs in UNICEF (including in-kind contributions of staff time) will be covered by the Evaluation Office.

43.   The Peer Review budget will be funded primarily by UNICEF Evaluation Office. It is expected that this will be less than $70,000 in total.

Annex A: Panel Composition

Following consultations with the UNEG/DAC Joint Task Force as well as with the UNICEF Evaluation Office, a Panel of professional evaluators has been assembled.

A number of important considerations were taken into account when composing the Panel membership: (i) relevant professional experience; (ii) independence: to avoid any potential or alleged conflict of interest or partiality, the Panel members do not have any close working relationship to UNICEF that might influence the Panel's position and deliberations; and (iii) institutional affiliations: members to be drawn from a variety of multilateral and bilateral development agencies, as well as from institutions in the South and transition countries.

The combination of these criteria together with the voluntary nature of serving on the Panel resulted in the following composition:

- Michael Spilsbury, Director Evaluation Office UNEP
- Per Øyvind Bastøe, Director, Evaluation Office, NORAD
- Nancy Macpherson, Managing Director, Evaluation Office, Rockefeller Foundation
- Anne-Claire Luzot, Chief Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office, WHO
- Shiv Kumar, Visiting Professor at the Ashoka University, Indian School of Business, and Harvard's Kennedy School of Government

The Panel will be assisted by a consultant advisor responsible for (a) data collection and information gathering; and (b) preliminary assessment of the collected information.

- Tullia Aiazzi, International Evaluation Consultant