

CONSOLIDATED AUDIT TRAIL

Mid-term Evaluation of the United Nations Evaluation Group Strategy 2014-2019

Identifier Paragraph	Questions / Comment	MTR Team response
Various	Eventually an exec summary should be produced	Yes- this will be added once the report is finalised
Various	Reference to “UNEG Staff” could be misunderstood by non UNEG agencies. Perhaps first time introduce this as “non-head evaluation staff of UNEG members (hereafter, ‘UNEG staff’)”. Also clarify what is meant by UNEG members (evaluation staff respondents from UNEG network members)?	This is clarified in Annexes – a footnote has been added to direct the reader
6	“No reliable numbers were available”. What is meant by this? No figures were provided?	Text revised
11	In some cases, completing the survey after participating in the SWOT workshops could have conditioned responses to some of the survey questions, such as the top strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. May be worthy of mentioning.	Text revised – Para 12
12	SWOT workshops. Are the breakdowns available on participation in the workshops by UNEG head or non UNEG head? Would be of interest to report this, in so far as some of the findings refer specifically to the outcome of the workshops. Would be good to have a list of participants in the workshop annexed.	This is given in the Annexes.
18	I am not sure I would fully jump to the conclusion in your second to last sentence. The smaller agencies such simply cannot engage everywhere and need to make strategic choices. I would therefore interpret this analysis with caution. It would be also useful to include data and analysis (under effectiveness) as to the percentage of active participants in the working groups and how many UNEG members are really engaged. Do we reach 50%?	Text revised. The network analysis gives a clear indication of how many agencies are engaged. See Annex E
Para 29	Factual accuracy “The group was encouraged to produce a report on the issue, which was deemed only marginally useful and which required the energy and time of members to manage a consultancy and detracted from the original purpose of the group.” The group was not encouraged, the group decided as part of its own work plan to conduct an exploratory study on decentralized evaluation in the different agencies members of DEIG. The issue here was that once the report was finalized and after four iterations of	Text revised. The report on Decentralised evaluation is on the UNEG website, so has been circulated to all members.

	comments. A member of the group claimed that the report could not be shared among UNEG members because it did not portray well the situation in her agency. This resulted in other UNEG members not part of the group to benefit from a wealth of information and knowledge and is an example of how knowledge does not flow based on individual narrow perspectives instead considering the greater good.	
30	With 40% of key informants being users of evaluation, one would think there would be more findings to report in this paragraph.	Additional text added
	Mixed influence on member organizations' practice. I would think that most if not all PRs have led to increased resources and recognition for the function (with some exceptions such as UNRWA where the organization is more or less broke). As a matter of fact one of the recs should be to strategically invest in PRs of small functions to help them in achieving a greater maturity level. One idea could also be to develop an biennium maturity rating/online assessment for members (e.g. GAIN survey).	Text revised. Not all PRs have had this effect (see eg ITC) Recommendations noted
	Clear line between positive view on the value and UNEG efforts --- I don't see how this would be even feasible. The value perception comes from the work of the office --- which indirectly would have benefited from the well recognized increased professionalization of the function	Text revised.
31	Reference to UNITAR does not seem correct: "...supported by a grant to ITAD by UNITAR....". Rather, UNITAR should be included as example similar to ILO, with no grant referenced.	See first line on brochure front cover. Text revised
31	Reference to rate of performance is not entirely clear: "During interviews, when asked to rate UNEG's performance on a scale of 1 (weak) to 10 (strong), members felt that at best of times UNEG was rated between 6---8. Currently it is judged more in the range of 3---5." Does "members" refer to UNEG members or interviewees? What time period does "currently" refer to?	Text revised
32	The paragraph could make reference to reasons why less attention has been given over the past year to 18 months: emphasis is currently on devising a partnership strategy to provide for a more structured approach to partnerships.	Text revised
33	Indeed we have not sufficiently reached out to non--evaluation partners in the UN system. Having said so my recent late 2017 effort to be included in	UNDG efforts noted in text

	<p>UNDG was rebuffed. There is in general hesitance to open the door to oversight bodies as management wants to be able to openly discuss and the trend is for less inclusiveness not more.</p>	
40	<p>Indeed as said later any fundraising would need to be around specific products, e.g metaevaluations. But fundraising takes time and effort and then needs to be reported on. I don't think this is realistic for the time being.</p>	Text revised
41	<p>Figures would be helpful here and what --- if we keep up current membership fees --- is feasible and what it could fund. I would look to Arild to speak more to the role of the EC but am not surprised that members don't see it. In my view the EC was overseeing the secretariat, the admin and finance. If this is function is being dropped it will need to be created. Not sure the VC model is the best --- this needs continuity.</p>	Text revised – figures added.
42	<p>Any fund management brings transaction costs. But these can be reduced. For instance UNESCO and others have recruited consultants through advancing the funds and then being reimbursed. This is the kind of engagement we need to see more as the secretariat's administrative role needs to be leaner</p>	Text revised.
43	<p>Can you say more about the pros and cons of these models --- either here or for the way forward. UNRIAS is too limited while ALNAP is too big. Remember also that ALNAP secretariat oversees all activity and product preparations --- quite a different and more robust business model. We are somewhere on the spectrum between ECG and ALNAP. Did you by chance look at IDEAS and some of those newer eval networks?</p>	Text revised
47	<p>Reference to AGM being closed is not entirely accurate. The AGM was only closed for the last day, not the entire AGM.</p>	Text revised
53---54	<p>the document addresses well the MTR objectives except perhaps in terms of the use of financial resources and efficiency issue. I understand it is difficult to assess the efficiency of economic resources invested in UNEG when the results are sometimes unclear (value for money not well established).</p> <p>At the same time, the use of term" robust financial reserve available" brings the reader to the idea that the building up of the reserve was intentional, not</p>	<p>Text added regarding the reserve (para 36)</p> <p>Text revised, though a classic efficiency analysis is not feasible.</p>

	the result of inefficiency in the use of resources. Could you please confirm? In terms of the efficiency of the resources used in different SO, efficiency could be assessed and linked to relative value of the SO. In conclusion, in para 53---54 the analysis would benefit from a discussion on the resource allocation and efficacy in use.	
66	last sentence --- I would add here N&S and adherence and "competency development"	Text revised
67	Cf finding in para 49 on inclusiveness	Noted
Recs	The draft report contains too many recommendations. This may risk losing the attention from the important decision that UNEG has to face. Long term future strategies (5---8) will depend the options taken for recommendations 1---3. They may become redundant	Text revised to clarify sequencing issues.
Rec 1b	UN <u>political or policy fora</u> such as the HLPF (HLPF is not inter-agency)	Text revised
Rec 1c	This is especially true in a cross ---country context. I am not sure I see this last point. UNEG simply cannot be at the country level other than UNEG members doing a joint UNEG evaluation. It would not be realistic to expect more and a regular engagement to 195 or so countries. We should not pretend we can.	Text revised
Rec 2	Rephrase to read:UNEG...working group during an interim transition period until the AGM 2019 focusing on strengthening the governance and working modalities of UNEG.	Text revised
Rec 2c	Not sure it is clear. How does this relate to the long term strategy? I would move this point there.	Text moved to Rec 5 but appears redundant
Rec 3	Suggest not to call these working groups but rather task forces.	Text revised
Rec 3a	Why 8? Can you suggest some way to make it representative? I would also like to suggest that during the interim period whoever leads one of the TFs should be a member of an interim ESC.	Text revised
Rec 3d	at the end: suggest replacing outputs by "expected results"	Text revised
Rec 4b	suggest to add: In line with other networks, additional membership categories such as associated member could be considered.	Text revised
Rec 5	develop a 2020---2025 strategy for <i>adoption at the AGM 2019.</i>	Text revised
Rec 5a	a) audit and oversight ---(comment: audit is part of oversight in the UN as is evaluation)	Text revised on a) Text added.

	suggest a new 2): meta evaluations and other evaluation products to be prepared for major reform/A2030 fora. This could be funded by UNEG budget or through RM with interested donors and UNEG member agencies and led by the lead agency/agencies for a specific SDG.	
Rec 5d	suggest adding: The use of on---line CoPs and online discussions regarding key emerging issues should be pursued.	Text added to 5c
Rec 5e	set a goal of undertaking at least one joint UNEG evaluation per year. Ensure other joint initiatives such as the IAHE are also considered UNEG joint evaluations	Text revised (though this is very ambitious, especially regarding IAHE)
Rec 6	Could be made more specific e.g. when referring to 'others'.	Text revised.
Rec 6	Not sure this is sufficiently clear. I think competency development, EPE and certification is one key area we should not lose sight of.	Text revised
7dUNEG...and how members engage with UNEG, setting clear membership engagement parameters.	Text revised
Rec	Maybe one final comment is that we need to become more proactive and forward looking. Not sure where to put this.	Text added.
Annex 2	See earlier comment. Para 3. How large is the cluster of organizations with no affiliations? Of those with multiple connections, how many are large offices with more than 5 staff?	Text revised regarding non-affiliated organisations. Further details given in Annex E
Annex 2	Can you explain Map 2 how you arrived at the data?	See details in Annex E