



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
11 April 2024

Original: English

For decision

United Nations Children's Fund

Executive Board

Annual session 2024

11–14 June 2024

Item 10 of the provisional agenda*

Management response to the evaluation report

Evaluation of UNICEF investments towards institutional strengthening for social and behaviour change

Summary

In 2023, the UNICEF Evaluation Office, in collaboration with the UNICEF Social and Behaviour Change (SBC) team in the Programme Group, conducted an institutional evaluation to understand how, if at all, investments from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and UNICEF between 2017 and 2022 improved SBC institutional capacity and integration at global, regional and country levels, and to what extent this improved capacity enabled the organization to deliver better-quality SBC programming. The evaluation identified eight recommendations to be taken into consideration by UNICEF.

The present management response provides a summary of the actions agreed across divisions and offices at the global, regional and country levels.

Elements of a draft decision for consideration by the Executive Board are provided in section V.

* E/ICEF/2024/10.

Note: The present document was processed in its entirety by UNICEF.

I. Overview

1. The evaluation of UNICEF investments towards institutional strengthening for social and behaviour change (SBC) provides an evidence-based analysis of the effectiveness of combined catalytic investments from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and UNICEF between 2017 and 2022. These investments span across two Strategic Plan cycles, and the evaluation concluded that they were fundamental in developing institutional capacity in SBC. Overall, the evaluation broadly indicated significant progress, with critical reflections on inconsistency of further investments required to sustain this progress.

2. In particular, the evaluation found that both investments helped to create more consistency in UNICEF regional staffing in five out of seven regions, bolstered external support and supported the development of key global resources, all essential to foster greater application of SBC across Strategic Plan Goal Areas. This opened opportunities to utilize novel approaches based on social and behavioral sciences to deliver quality SBC programming across sectors, regions, and different country contexts.

3. The evaluation report and effort encompassed an analysis of SBC capacity and programming at the various organizational levels: global, regional and country, and drew conclusions on what the institutional strengthening of SBC was able to achieve over the period of analysis.

4. The methods and sources for the evaluation considered (i) a review of documents, including the core global public goods, and organizational guidance; (ii) a review of programme monitoring and evaluation data, corporate reporting, financial expenditure, as well as human resources data; (iii) 75 in-depth interviews coupled with an online survey (605 respondents) engaging a broad range of internal and external stakeholders, both SBC and non-SBC ones (including management), at global, regional and country levels; and (iv) eight case studies (Armenia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, Iraq, the Niger, the Pacific Islands and Somalia) to review institutional changes at the country level. The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach and triangulated the findings, drawing upon all sources.

II. Analysis and findings

A. Introduction

5. The evaluation report recognized the significance of the SBC function within UNICEF towards achieving better results and outcomes for children across all programme areas, and the organizational commitments and evolution of SBC from 2017 to 2022, taking into consideration that in the current UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2022–2025, SBC aims to “empower individuals and communities and lower structural barriers that hinder people from adopting positive practices and societies from becoming more equitable, inclusive, cohesive and peaceful”. The evolution over the second half of the analysis period focused on an insitutional transition from communication for development (C4D) towards SBC programming, bringing in a more seamless fashion the perspectives and insights from multiple disciplines such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, economics, communication and behavioral sciences, to inform UNICEF programming. The shift from C4D to SBC also aimed to blend social and behavioural sciences with community insights and meaningful participation processes to enable people and the communities to which they belong expand their control over the decisions they make.

6. Within this context, the evaluation explored the extent to which the aforementioned investments contributed to improvements in UNICEF programming in four key areas: SBC institutional capacity; SBC programming quality; development and use of global public goods; and the readiness of UNICEF to use SBC as a change strategy to support the achievements envisaged in the Strategic Plan.

B. Main findings

SBC institutional capacity

7. The evaluation report highlighted that institutional capacity improved significantly both internally and externally, with global as well as national partners at the country level. However, the findings highlighted how the investments were made amid significant systemic challenges that vary at the country level, leading to uneven implementation of strategies and resources across sectors and regions. The inconsistencies were found due to variations in leadership commitment to SBC, and in governance and coordination. While there has been some advancement in the capacities of SBC staff and partners, these individuals often lack influence in decision-making processes, which hampers their ability to advocate for higher-quality SBC programming across different sectors.

SBC programming quality

8. The evaluation report identified some of the programming quality improvements that have been made through focusing on the standardization and use of programming guidance and initiatives. The improvements in programming quality were attributed to increased technical support to country offices, the participatory processes for SBC global programme guidance and standards, and increased emphasis on quality SBC programming.

9. However, the findings also noted that each element of programming quality could be strengthened through more equitable positioning and funding of SBC across sectors and programmes to lead to programming that is participatory, community-led, evidence-based, and sustainable rather than overly relying on short-term, project-specific and communication-based efforts.

Development and use of global public goods

10. The evaluation explored the development and uptake of global public goods, which were intended to further advance the technical standardization and guidance contributing to an improved and shared understanding of SBC and quality community engagement across UNICEF, as well as inform capacity strengthening. The most frequently used global public goods were the Minimum Quality Standards and Indicators for Community Engagement, the SBC Programme Guidance and SBC resources for humanitarian programming, each of which were most notably used by UNICEF internal teams (SBC more than other programme and sectoral staff), as well as by external stakeholders.

11. The development and use of global public goods also identified the need for investing in further application and usability and working with country-level implementers on the contextualization and translation across country contexts.

Institutional readiness to use SBC as a change strategy

12. As a final element of this evaluation, the readiness of UNICEF to use SBC as a change strategy to achieve positive results for children was assessed. A four-point scale (insufficient, nascent, sufficient or strong) was used to assess readiness across

five components: (a) operational: nascent to sufficient; (b) technical: sufficient; (c) positioning and leadership: sufficient; (d) governance and accountability: nascent; and (e) partnerships: nascent.

III. Recommendations

13. Overall, UNICEF agrees with the proposed recommendations in the evaluation and welcomes the set of recommendations aimed at further institutionalizing the SBC function within UNICEF. Some exceptions are the specific recommended actions outlined below (recommended actions 3.2, 3.5 and 5.2) that UNICEF considers to either be out of the scope of the current evaluation or for which the proposed action lacks sufficient evidence of effectiveness to achieve the proposed goal.

14. Leveraging the plan detailed below, UNICEF aims to address the issues and challenges identified by the evaluation through an overarching multi-year SBC institutionalization, strengthening and leadership strategy, to be developed jointly between the Programme Group, the Office of the Executive Director and UNICEF regional offices, in order to bring strategic coherence to a set of actions and integrate all aspects of the management response to this evaluation.

15. This overarching action will encapsulate all of the specific management response actions and allow for:

(a) Creating the conditions for senior leadership oversight on a multi-year effort to strengthen SBC programming as an area of the UNICEF comparative advantage – in development and emergency programming alike;

(b) Including additional external-facing elements for UNICEF to increasingly play a leadership role in the community of practice;

(c) Defining a blueprint for the main focus of the UNICEF SBC Global Technical Team over the next few years.

IV. Key evaluation recommendations and UNICEF management response specific actions

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<p>Evaluation recommendation 1 (Enhanced fundraising): Seek out, advocate for and prioritize donor funding that addresses systemic, social and behavioural drivers of results for children across the development and humanitarian programming continuum.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF senior leadership, the Public Partnerships Division and the Private Fundraising and Partnerships Division, along with the SBC Global Technical Team, should co-organize high-level meetings to socialize donors and the interlocutors that fundraise on behalf of UNICEF programmes to the new programme model for SBC, the existing social and behavioural sciences evidence underlying these new approaches, and the time and effort required to achieve impact. UNICEF should advocate for a renewed SBC funding strategy with key institutional donors, including public donors as well as philanthropic organizations and those with previous investments in SBC. It is recommended that this strategy is focused on positioning SBC approaches towards systems strengthening and emergency preparedness and response, and that it specifically goes beyond communication approaches, articulating key resource requirements. Across humanitarian and development contexts, UNICEF should institutionalize resources for SBC that are aligned to clear theories of change with SBC contributions and results. This will require engaging with the Partnerships teams to establish benchmarks for SBC funding within corporate funds raised across all thematic priority areas. This benchmark should also be operationalized in Global Humanitarian Thematic Funding and Humanitarian Action for Children appeals. UNICEF should explore establishing an approach for soft earmarking of SBC funds within thematic fund pools (that are deployed directly to country offices), defining clear approaches and results that could be achieved through appropriate resourcing. <p>Management response: Agree. As underlined in the report, donor funding for SBC is still based on a limited understanding of SBC, primarily prioritizing awareness-raising, education and communication campaigns. As the evaluation acknowledged, funding for SBC is short-term, projectized, and focused on a single result or output, rather than on addressing systemic and underlying drivers of change and tracking contributions to outcome-level change.</p>				
<p>Develop sectoral SBC value propositions, investment tools and a mapping of interested donors to inform a funding strategy for the period 2025–2030 that is focused on socializing the role of SBC in achieving UNICEF results.</p> <p><i>Aligned with UNICEF current and emerging programmatic priorities; mainstreaming into</i></p>	<p>Programme Group (SBC and sectors); SBC Global Technical Team; support of the Public Partnerships Division and Private Fundraising and Partnerships Division</p>	<p>By November 2024 (socialization will be on a continuous basis)</p>	<p>Not started</p>	

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<i>proposals templates and toolkits used by the Public Partnerships Division, the Private Fundraising and Partnerships Division and the National Committees for UNICEF</i>				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 2 (Enhanced financial investments): Establish standards and guidance to systematically distribute SBC funding across all programme areas and contexts so that funding is reflective of the required contribution of SBC to core results.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The UNICEF Programme Group, alongside the Office of Emergency Operations and the Division of Data, Analytics, Planning and Monitoring, should include specific funding benchmarks for SBC programming, and for specialized monitoring and evaluation capacities, in budget protocols. It is recommended that these benchmarks are developed based on country programme size and programme need and that they incorporate human resourcing as well as key partnership needs within them, building on the current recommended funding models. 2. The UNICEF Division of Data, Analytics, Planning, and Monitoring should include the different dimensions of SBC and related drivers in corresponding global guidelines. The behavioural drivers model and socio-ecological model should be integrated in the country programme planning guidance, and SBC-related outputs should be included in the results frameworks of country programme documents. Regional planning advisers, together with SBC regional advisers, should work towards more integration of SBC results and corresponding indicators in country programme planning documents and processes. 3. At the country level, UNICEF representatives and deputy representatives should more systematically include SBC analysis within evidence syntheses and corresponding situation analyses informing country programme planning and annual planning processes to better identify discrete social and behavioural challenges and drivers for each programme area (thus resulting in fundraising to address them). <p>Management response: Agree. The report finds that the inclusion of SBC as a core change strategy within the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2022–2025 has elevated its positioning within the organization. However, the evaluation highlighted that individual country and sectoral leaders continue to be the primary determinant of SBC positioning and funding within each office and programme area, with wide variations depending on countries and sectors. Actions are outlined below to solidify the gains obtained through the investments and address these limitations.</p>				
<p>Develop and endorse a set of tools to improve the predictability of SBC resourcing.</p> <p><i>This will include establishing minimum operational standards for delivering on the change strategy; creating internal and external guidelines for costing SBC-related</i></p>	<p>Programme Group; SBC Global Technical Team; Private Fundraising and Partnerships Division; Office of Emergency Programmes; Division of Financial and Administrative Management;</p>	<p>Fourth quarter 2024</p>	<p>Not started</p>	

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<i>interventions; developing context-specific funding benchmarks for SBC in governmental budget protocols and processes; creating an SBC tag to track expenses beyond generic and specific intervention codes.</i>	Division of Data, Analytics, Planning and Monitoring; regional offices			
<p>Evaluation recommendation 3 (Improved leadership support and capacity related to SBC): Ensure that SBC staff are represented in organization-wide decision-making processes and structures at the global, regional and country levels. Ensure that all leaders tasked with representing SBC in such forums have the requisite expertise and understanding to advocate effectively for SBC and to make informed decisions.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF should establish senior SBC posts that are commensurate with the size and role of the programme. This should include at least one dedicated director-level SBC position at the global level. UNICEF should include at least one person with core SBC competencies in the Global Management Team and all regional and country management teams. Institutional strengthening actions and investments to improve SBC positioning, investments and programming should be tracked, for instance in management tools such as annual management plans. UNICEF should establish a set of core commitments at the corporate level related to elevating UNICEF global leadership in SBC that are then included as a standard topic in senior leadership meetings. Progress on these commitments should be regularly monitored and reported to management bodies including the Global Management Team and regional and country management teams. SBC skills should be incorporated into the job descriptions of all senior programme officers and managers, including representatives, deputy representatives and programme chiefs, to strengthen the understanding of SBC and facilitate the institutionalization of SBC approaches across the organization. Performance reviews of senior leadership should include a specific section to review senior leaders' capacity and completed actions to support the use and integration of core change strategies, including SBC. The UNICEF Division of Human Resources and the Global Shared Services Centre, with the support of the SBC team, should establish a senior leadership training focused on applying SBC to achieving results for children. Additional capacity-building tools should be developed to provide practical guidance on how SBC approaches can achieve priority sectoral results. <p>Management response: Partially agree. UNICEF agrees with the recommendations apart from recommended actions 3.2 (as the memberships of the Global Management Team and regional management teams are not based on programmatic representation) and 3.5 (as the scope of such recommendation is deemed to be beyond the scope of the evaluation). With regard to recommended capacity-building actions in 3.6, the SBC team will establish a training programme in conjunction with the Division of Human Resources and the Global Shared Services Centre offered to programme leads at each level of the organization.</p>				

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<p>Leverage human resources and regional and country management mechanisms to enhance SBC ownership and leadership.</p> <p><i>This will include assigning a global talent manager for SBC to support the development of an SBC skills framework for country managers and programme chiefs; including minimum SBC roles in standard job descriptions; including a session on SBC in the orientation course for new representatives; and establishing a training programme for programme leads focused on applying SBC to achieve results for children and accelerating progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals.</i></p>	<p>Programme Group/SBC; Division of Human Resources; Office of the Executive Director; regional offices</p>	<p>Second quarter 2025</p>	<p>Under way</p>	
<p>Evaluation recommendation 4 (Improvements in evidence-based programming): Provide context-specific, actionable guidance to ensure greater consistency in SBC governance, coordination and resourcing mechanisms.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF senior management should review and validate the SBC Operational Guidance developed by UNICEF in 2021–2022 and provide a directive to mainstream the approved guidance (which indicates how SBC programming should be managed, funded and integrated into other programmes based on specific contextual factors). In order to make the SBC Operational Guidance actionable for country offices, the SBC Global Technical Team should develop an associated and easy-to-use decision matrix. UNICEF should hold a targeted orientation for all representatives and deputy representatives on integrating SBC at the country level once the SBC Operational Guidance has been validated. UNICEF should streamline the approved SBC Operational Guidance into corporate guidance and planning processes across all institutional levels and integrate the content in the Guidance on Country Programme Planning, the Programme Policy and Procedure Site and the new Rights and Results-Based Management training. <p>Management response: Agree. While decentralization is a strength of UNICEF and it would not be appropriate to recommend a one-size-fits-all approach, UNICEF will pursue the actions below to help managers better calibrate SBC programmes, create capacity commensurate with local needs and resources, and strengthen evidence-based programming. With regard to the proposed action recommended in 4.3, the recently developed UNICEF guidance on developing situation analysis reflects the need to analyse behaviours, attitudes and practices that are detrimental to the full realization of children’s rights as underlying and root causes. The current documentation on country programme planning methodology is prompting country programmes to identify strategies to affect systemic</p>				

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
change that leads to outcome-level changes, including SBC. The Programme Policy and Procedure Site will furthermore demonstrate how those different strategies are being used in country programmes.				
<p>Develop a series of options for local SBC operational and delivery models.</p> <p><i>Options will be based on a typology of contexts, to offer regional and country offices viable alternatives to adapt SBC capacities to different operational settings and political economies. They will reflect affordability considerations, and explore less traditional delivery models (e.g. subregional hubs with high-level pooled capacity to support groups of small offices or upstream policy work in high-income and upper-middle-income countries).</i></p>	SBC Global Technical Team, including regional offices	Second quarter 2025	Under way	
<p>Review corporate programme development and planning processes to ensure that SBC is adequately leveraged to achieve results for children.</p> <p><i>This will include the updating of SBC country strategic indicators in advance of the next Strategic Plan, as well as endorsement and socialization of the SBC Operational Guidance to support country programme development processes.</i></p>	Programme Group; SBC Global Technical Team; Data, Analytics, Planning and Monitoring Division; regional offices	First quarter 2025	Under way	
<p>Evaluation recommendation 5 (SBC evidence generation and use): Increase the prioritization and funding for SBC evidence generation and use.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF should include an SBC evidence generation section in all funding proposals. Proposals should be reviewed by both an SBC focal person and a planning, monitoring or evaluation focal person. Building on the precedent set by allocating 1 per cent of all programmatic budgets to evaluation, it is recommended to allocate a 3 per cent minimum of all SBC proposals for SBC-related evidence generation, including data, monitoring, research, evaluation and 				

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<p>knowledge management. The exact percentage allocated might be higher, based on a programme-specific assessment of the contribution of social and behavioural evidence to results generation.</p> <p>3. The UNICEF SBC Global Technical Team should conduct initial assessments to understand existing social and behavioural data collection capacity and systems at regional and country levels.</p> <p>4. UNICEF should invest in building the capacity of national and subnational actors to understand what social and behavioural evidence is and how it can be used.</p> <p>5. UNICEF should directly invest in building social and data collection systems where they do not yet exist. This might advocate for and fund the adoption of social and behavioural indicators in existing systems, building the capacity of local actors to collect and analyse data, and/or fostering partnerships between local universities or research institutions and Governments.</p> <p>6. UNICEF should continue its investment in building SBC monitoring and evaluation capacity and recommend further investment in building capacity for SBC impact evaluation, behavioural insights and formative research. In particular, UNICEF should invest in building capacity for SBC evidence generation in humanitarian contexts, including the dissemination of examples and case studies that focus on systems strengthening and capacity-building in humanitarian contexts. This evidence should be disseminated and promoted through existing knowledge generation/exchange platforms, such as the Social Science in Humanitarian Action Platform.</p> <p>Management response: Partially agree. UNICEF agrees with all specific recommendations apart from recommended action 5.2, as establishing such specific percentages is difficult in practice, and can create undesired precedents, as well as unintended consequences, if existing levels of funding for SBC evidence generation recede from where they currently are.</p> <p>UNICEF has been a leader in evidence generation through Community Rapid Assessments, large behavioural survey studies, applied behavioural science, and the use of anthropological and sociological approaches. It aims to sustain such approaches and solidify its intellectual leadership in the field.</p>				
<p>Develop and implement a UNICEF-wide social and behavioural evidence generation strategy.</p> <p><i>This will cover the integration of social and behavioural data in country office evidence generation mechanisms and planning processes, as well as better integrating social and behavioural results and indicators across sectors; consolidating SBC capacity in the Division of Data, Analytics, Planning and Monitoring and related regional positions; integrating behavioural data in global</i></p>	<p>Programme Group; SBC Global Technical Team; Data, Analytics, Planning and Monitoring Division; UNICEF Innocenti – Global Office of Research and Foresight; Office of Emergency Programmes; regional offices</p>	<p>Second quarter 2025</p>	<p>Under way</p>	

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<i>household surveys; and strengthening national partners' capacity for social and behavioural data collection and analysis.</i>				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 6 (Strengthened external capacity): Invest in strengthening SBC systems and capacity among key implementing partners, especially Governments.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SBC country teams (with support from regional teams) should work together to develop an approach for strategic engagement with line ministries to clearly establish SBC outcomes that provide an opportunity for SBC institutionalization. 2. UNICEF funding requests for SBC should include the creation of sustainable SBC systems within Governments, and local systems and should aim to build sustainable capacity within these local systems. 3. SBC teams across all levels should consider sustainable capacity-building methods such as partnerships with local academic institutions and shadowing opportunities or secondments with SBC teams for practical, on-the job learning for external partners and government officials. 4. The SBC Global Technical Team should develop a good practice guide for building capacity within national systems that includes examples from countries and programmes that have successfully done so. 5. The SBC Global Technical Team should develop a database of academic partnerships and other systems strengthening initiatives so that country offices can learn from good practices, as well as establish regional linkages between universities or other research institutions. <p>Management response: Agree. Collaboration and capacity building with Governments and national partners are cornerstones of UNICEF work across the world. As the report notes, UNICEF strong partnerships are key to both delivering and monitoring the impact of SBC programming. The capacity of UNICEF to engage with partners, including government partners and civil society organizations, could also be strengthened through a nuanced integration of SBC in public partnerships, blending advocacy/influence with fundraising capacity. To strengthen this collaboration, integration and the capacity of partners, the actions listed below will be pursued.</p>				
<p>Revise current UNICEF and SBC guidance on system strengthening to better illustrate how SBC approaches can be used as a lever for systemic change.</p> <p><i>This will focus on improving the collaboration between rights holders and duty bearers (interface through services, front-line workers, participatory governance and accountability)</i></p>	<p>Programme Group/SBC; close collaboration with sectors, including social policy/public finance for children); regional offices</p>	<p>Fourth quarter 2024</p>	<p>Under way</p>	

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<i>mechanisms) and can inform internal and external capacity assessment and capacity-building efforts.</i>				
<p>Develop, endorse and disseminate a UNICEF programmatic offer on risk communication and community engagement.</p> <p><i>The offer will be used to solidify this area of global leadership across all emergencies (humanitarian and public health emergencies); create consistency when engaging with donors and partners; affirm regional and in-country leadership to strengthen inter-agency risk communication and community engagement coordination and surge/deployment mechanisms; mobilize core resources for stable and predictable operating capacities in UNICEF; and engage the Inter-Agency Standing Committee around anchoring of risk communication and community engagement.</i></p>	Programme Group/SBC and Public Health Emergencies teams; Office of Emergency Programmes; regional offices	Third quarter 2024	Under way	
<p>Evaluation recommendation 7 (Strengthened internal capacity): Localize existing global public goods and increase intentional operationalization efforts to ensure greater uptake among country-level stakeholders.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The UNICEF SBC Global Technical Team and SBC regional teams should develop mechanisms to adapt all global goods at the country level, including technical standards and capacity-building tools, to reflect the contexts of specific regions and countries, the core results that each sector is trying to achieve, as well as the linguistic needs of UNICEF staff and its partners. 2. Where relevant, UNICEF should facilitate the translation of SBC global goods into local languages, moving beyond publishing global goods in only a few of the official United Nations languages. Where full translation is not feasible, we recommend including a glossary to define key terms in local languages. Furthermore, any new SBC global goods that are created should include development and testing in local languages (moving beyond post-publication translation). 3. Given the overwhelming number of tools that exist, the priority of UNICEF should be to evaluate the effectiveness of and subsequently localize existing global goods rather than create new ones. However, if and when new global goods are needed, UNICEF 				

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
<p>should ensure that they are designed using a co-creation process with all users in order to build in user needs, local relevance and dissemination from the beginning.</p> <p>4. The SBC global team and SBC regional teams should facilitate specific dissemination and localization plans for each SBC global good and should prioritize mainstreaming existing global goods into national and subnational systems prior to the development of new tools.</p> <p>Management response: Agree.</p>				
<p>Identify and prioritize core SBC public goods for regional adaptation and contextualization, supporting their translation in relevant languages.</p>	<p>Programme Group/SBC; regional offices</p>	<p>Fourth quarter 2024</p>	<p>Under way</p>	
<p>Evaluation recommendation 8 (Strengthened partnerships): Increase private sector engagement to drive further innovation.</p> <p>Specific actions recommended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The UNICEF SBC Global Technical Team should prioritize collaboration with the Private Fundraising and Partnerships teams at global and regional levels to advance opportunities for developing high-potential private sector partnerships linked to results frameworks. Eventually, this guidance should be included within the SBC Operational Guidance for country offices. UNICEF should create specific guidance on engaging with the private sector, building on any existing resources within UNICEF related to ethical private sector engagement. Guidance should include recommendations on how to communicate the value add of SBC to the private sector, a compilation of good practices, and an ethics framework for engaging with private sector partners. UNICEF should systematically promote including information on partnerships in UNISON – the UNICEF global corporate partnership management platform for private and public sector relationships – to have a shared global database of partnerships at all levels and thus facilitate improved collaboration. The SBC Global Technical Team and SBC regional teams should develop and facilitate an advocacy and engagement orientation for working with the private sector. <p>Management response: Agree. UNICEF notes that in the context of country-level operations, partnerships with the private sector are notably less established compared to others. To strengthen private partnerships as a means to enhance UNICEF technical capacity on behaviourally informed programming and broaden the organization’s outreach, the actions listed below will be undertaken by the organization.</p>				
<p>Identify and expand partnership collaboration with the private sector to align</p>	<p>Programme Group/SBC and Business Engagement for</p>	<p>Fourth quarter 2024</p>	<p>Under way</p>	

<i>Action</i>	<i>Responsible section(s)</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Actions taken and implementation stage: Not started; Under way; Completed; Cancelled</i>	<i>Supporting documents</i>
with businesses' environmental, social and corporate governance and leverage potential financial, in-kind and technical contributions related to innovation for SBC.	Child Rights teams; SBC Global Technical Team; Private Fundraising and Partnerships Division; Division of Global Communication and Advocacy; regional offices; country offices			

V. Draft decision

The Executive Board

1. *Takes note* of the annual report for 2023 on the evaluation function in UNICEF ([E/ICEF/2024/20](#)) and its management response ([E/ICEF/2024/21](#));
 2. *Also takes note* of the evaluation of UNICEF approaches to advocacy, its summary ([E/ICEF/2024/22](#)) and its management response ([E/ICEF/2024/23](#));
 3. *Further takes note* of the evaluation of UNICEF investments towards institutional strengthening for social and behaviour change, its summary ([E/ICEF/2024/24](#)) and its management response ([E/ICEF/2024/25](#)).
-