



# Self-Assessment Maturity Matrix for UN Evaluation Functions

This document was prepared by the UNEG Peer Review Working Group to provide a normative framework for Peer Reviews against the *UNEG Norms & Standards for Evaluation*.

It builds on earlier normative frameworks for UN evaluation functions developed by the United Nations' Joint Inspection Unit and its Office for Internal Oversight Services.

## Foreword

The *UNEG Self-Assessment Maturity Matrix for UN Evaluation Functions* is the latest in the series of tools and resources produced by the UNEG Peer Review Working Group to support evaluation professionalization work across the United Nations (UN).

Drawing on earlier work by the UN Joint Inspection Unit and Office for Internal Oversight Services, the Matrix builds directly on the *UNEG Norms and Standards* and operationalizes the fourteen norms for evaluation into 53 dimensions of performance. They are accompanied by a set of performance attributes which describe expected behaviours and procedures for increasing the ‘maturity’ of an organization’s evaluation function. In so doing, the tool provides not only a one-time ‘snapshot’ of the performance of an evaluation function but also provides a roadmap for evaluation offices seeking to strengthen their functions and organization in line with UN good practice.

The *Maturity Matrix* will be of great use to UN agencies seeking to further professionalize their evaluation function, and will be of interest and use to our partners in the broader international evaluation community.

I would like to commend the Peer Review Working Group for developing this and thank, in particular, Michael Spilsbury (UNEP), Gugsu Farice (ICAO), Geoff Guerts (UNESCO) and Pietro Tornese and Andrew Fyfe (UNCDF) who were the principal authors.



Oscar A. Garcia  
UNEG Chair

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Performance Criteria and Benchmarks by UNEG Evaluation Norm</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Part A – General Norms for Evaluation</b>	<b>3</b>
Norm 1 - Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets	3
Norm 2 - Utility	3
Norm 3 - Credibility	5
Norm 4 - Independence	7
Norm 5 - Impartiality	2
Norm 6 - Ethics	3
Norm 7 - Transparency	3
Norm 8 - Human rights and gender equality	4
Norm 9 - National evaluation capacities	4
Norm 10 – Professionalism	5
<b>Part B - Institutional Norms</b>	<b>7</b>
Norm 11 - Enabling environment	7
Norm 12 - Evaluation policy	8
Norm 13 - Responsibility for the evaluation function	11
Norm 14 - Evaluation use and follow-up	13
<b>Annex 1. Assessment Criteria Mapped to the Structure of the JIU Evaluation Maturity Matrix</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex 2. Matrix Checklist</b>	<b>17</b>

## Introduction

This document presents a set of 53 organizational and performance criteria to help assess the maturity of the evaluation functions of United Nations (UN) agencies against the established norms for evaluation agreed in the updated [UN Evaluation Group \(UNEG\) Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#). It draws on the assessment criteria and benchmarks used by UN entities, such as the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), and has been used in recent peer reviews of UN evaluation entities carried out under the auspices of UNEG<sup>1</sup>.

This Maturity Matrix helps operationalize the Norms and Standards by defining a practical normative framework for the assessment of the maturity of an evaluation entity against a set of defined **performance criteria** and **maturity benchmarks**. It is intended for use in self-assessment exercises and/or as a framework to inform more formal assessment exercises. In proposing these maturity benchmarks, this document supports the professionalization activities of any UN evaluation entity that is a UNEG member considering the commitment by members to move towards full adherence to the Norms and Standards. The document is conceived as a living document and will be updated to incorporate feedback from ongoing peer reviews and any future changes to the *UNEG Norms and Standards*.

The starting point for this exercise, as with all UNEG professionalization activities, is the agreed definition for evaluation in the Norms and Standards, namely:

‘...an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide useful, credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations, and lessons into the decision – making processes of organizations and stakeholders’.

‘The purposes of evaluation are to promote accountability and learning. Evaluation aims to understand why – and to what extent – intended and unintended results were achieved and to analyse the implications of the results. Evaluation can inform planning, programming, budgeting, implementation and reporting and contribute to evidence-based policymaking, development effectiveness and organizational effectiveness.’

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of the self-assessment matrix was tested as part of the Peer Reviews of UNESCO and ICAO undertaken in 2019, and this version of the Matrix was used in the Peer Reviews of the UNITAR and UNHCR in 2021.

# Performance criteria and benchmarks by UNEG Evaluation Norm

## Part A – General Norms for Evaluation

### Norm 1 - Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets

‘Within the United Nations system, it is the responsibility of evaluation managers and evaluators to uphold and promote, in their evaluation practice, the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed. In particular, they should respect, promote and contribute to the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>1) Extent to which evaluation managers are upholding and promoting the principles and values to which the UN is committed and, in particular, the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development</b>	Evaluation managers and evaluators show very little or no consideration of 2030 goals and targets in their work.	Consideration of 2030 goals and targets evident to a limited extent in the work of evaluation managers and evaluators but the evaluation function is focused mostly internally on their own development and immediate needs.	Evaluation managers and evaluators promote and consider 2030 goals and targets global trends and challenges in planning /coverage, joint work and methodology for complex evaluands and contexts.	Evaluation managers and evaluators promote, consider and make contributions to the 2030 goals and targets. The function demonstrates it is fully cognizant of global trends and challenges. The function is seeking new approaches and partnerships and revising old partnerships for cognitive diversity and new imperatives.

### Norm 2 - Utility

‘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 manifest through its use in making relevant and timely contributions to organizational learning, informed decision-making processes and accountability for results. Evaluations could also be used to contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>2) Timeliness in meeting stakeholder demands</b>	There is no work plan/set schedule for evaluations.	Evaluations are rarely completed within the set schedule nor readily feed into decision-making processes.	Evaluations are often completed within the set schedule and usually planned to feed into decision-making processes.	Evaluations are always completed within the set schedule and regularly feed into decision-making processes.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>3) Dissemination and communication strategy</b>	There is no dissemination and no communication strategy.	There is some dissemination, but it is not organized or systematic. There is no communication strategy.	There is a clear dissemination and communication strategy. Dissemination is well-organised and systematic. Standard approaches are used but not differentiated by audience.	There is a clear dissemination and communication strategy, it is fully resourced and communication / dissemination approaches are differentiated by audience.
<b>4) Internal sharing of evaluation results</b>	Evaluation results are not distributed or are distributed to only a limited internal audience. There are no established networks and systems for internal lessons learning and discussions.	Evaluations results are occasionally distributed internally and reach most internal audiences. There are few networks and systems for internal lessons learning and discussions, but these have not yet been institutionalised.	Evaluation results are regularly distributed internally, they reach a broad internal audience and are discussed with management. There are several networks and systems for internal lessons learning and discussions; they are partly institutionalised.	Evaluation results are systematically distributed across the organisation internally and discussed with management. Briefs and notes on lessons or innovations are developed and shared. There are continuous formal and informal meetings with stakeholders on evaluation findings and recommendations. Networks and systems for internal lessons learning and knowledge management are well established and functioning effectively.
<b>5) Sharing of evaluation results externally</b>	Evaluation results and lessons learned are not shared or are rarely shared with other UN organizations and external stakeholders.	Evaluation results and lessons learned are sometimes shared with other UN organizations and external stakeholders. The unit participates (on an ad hoc basis) in some external networks and systems for lessons learning and discussions.	Evaluation results and lessons learned are shared with other UN organizations. The unit participates in some external networks and systems for lessons learning and discussions. It sometimes makes presentations about its work via UNEG and/or to external stakeholders (including other evaluators, Members States beneficiaries, professional networks etc.).	Evaluation results and lessons learned are regularly and systematically shared with other UN organizations and external stakeholders (including other evaluators, Members States, beneficiaries, etc.). The unit participates in several external networks and systems for LL and discussions. It regularly makes presentations about its work.
<b>6) Contributions to advancing evaluation in the</b>	No initiatives	Few ad hoc initiatives are undertaken. Reflections are made.	Several initiatives undertaken periodically as part of	Initiatives are undertaken on a regular basis. The Unit is making a visible

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
context of the UN system’s work beyond UNEG <sup>1</sup>		Unit participates in forums and learning about advances.	the annual work plan. The Unit is partially engaged and making a contribution.	contribution and sharing innovations.
7) Effect of evaluation use on organizational effectiveness and evidence of impact	There is no evidence or examples of the effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness	There are a few examples showing effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness.	There are many examples showing effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness.	There is a comprehensive set of evidence that shows significant impact of the effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness.

<sup>1</sup> Elements to be included: i) innovations in evaluation (please specify); ii) new methods for what the UN does and how it works in addressing complex contexts and complicated evaluands (e.g. systems models; assessing normative work; real-time evaluation etc.); and iii) others (please specify).

**Norm 3 - Credibility**

‘Evaluations must be credible. Credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements of credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Evaluation results (or findings) and recommendations are derived from – or informed by – the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.’

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
8) Professional integrity and identity of the function	None	Low: < 4 elements apply	Moderate: 4 to 7 elements apply	High: >7 elements apply
Elements of professional integrity and identity show (check as applicable):				
<input type="checkbox"/>	There is independence but not isolation. There is engagement by the evaluation entity with the organization through clearly defined processes throughout the evaluation design and management cycle.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluation is overshadowed by other disciplines or made compliant to other related disciplines (monitoring, research, audit, assessments etc.), thus not fulfilling its value added.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff managing and conducting evaluation have training and experience in managing and conducting evaluations (on top of other disciplines) in line with the <a href="#">UNEG Evaluation Competency Framework</a> .			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Function has prominence or standing in the organization and with the governing bodies, for example, via regular peer review or external review exercises of the function, and independent quality assessment of evaluation reports.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluations address both performance (“doing things right”) and addresses critical evaluation questions of “doing the right things”, and strategic direction setting and appropriate positioning of the organization for added value and advancement.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	The approaches and methods used follow professional methods for evaluation in line with the Norms and Standards and appropriate quality assessment standards for evaluation reports.			

<input type="checkbox"/>	The accountability for results objective is an integral part of the entity's evaluation practice alongside an objective to support strategic learning and adaptive management. Evaluation methods ensure that evaluation findings seek to demonstrate directly attributable results as well as results that the organization is contributing to along with others.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	When co-located, there is equivalent treatment with other functions in terms of resourcing, coverage, recognition, status and staffing.			
<input type="checkbox"/>	The evaluation entity (Evaluation Office or Evaluation Unit) is recognized throughout the organization as an advocate for evaluation principles and is a respected custodian or steward of good UN evaluation practice.			
<b>9) Methodologies and types of evaluation</b>	Little consideration of best-suited methods or types of evaluation.	Some consideration given to the application of different methods and types of evaluations, but the evaluation function is limited in what it can do.	The evaluation function applies a range of different methods and undertakes various types of evaluation.	The evaluation function applies a wide range of different methods and undertakes various types of evaluation. It generates innovations in methodology and contributes to progress in the field.
<b>10) Controls and stakeholder engagement at various stages of the evaluation to ensure quality / content validity</b>	There are no controls in place.	The evaluation function uses only 1-3 of these controls. They are systematically and consistently used.	The evaluation function frequently uses a number of these controls (>3). These are systematically and consistently used.	The evaluation function always uses a variety of controls and stakeholder involvement (>5). These are systematically and consistently used.
<b>Elements of controls and stakeholder engagement to ensure quality / content validity (check as applicable):</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal quality assurance tools (based on evaluation norms and standards) at various stages of the evaluation (checklists, templates, etc.)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal peer review mechanisms			
<input type="checkbox"/>	UNEG quality checklists			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Expertise and mix of team members tailored to the evaluand <input type="checkbox"/> Use of consultants as evaluation and thematic experts			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reference / Advisory Groups made up of			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Internal experts			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Experts from other UN organizations			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Experts from outside the UN			
<input type="checkbox"/>	External Readers or review mechanism			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Formal endorsement of report by Reference / Advisory Groups or External Readers			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Periodic meetings with stakeholders at various stages of the evaluation, validating the evaluating results <input type="checkbox"/> Others (please specify): _____			
<b>11) Empirical/objective assessments of evaluation reports and compliance with N&amp;S and other requirements</b>	There are ad hoc assessments of the quality of reports.	There are regular assessments of the quality of reports (> every 2 years)	The quality of evaluation reports has not been assessed.	There are regular independent external assessments of the quality of reports (at least every 2 years)

Type of assessment (check as applicable):				
<input type="checkbox"/> Internal assessment of reports on the basis of:			<input type="checkbox"/> UNEG N&S	<input type="checkbox"/> other criteria
<input type="checkbox"/> External assessment of reports on the basis of:			<input type="checkbox"/> UNEG N&S	<input type="checkbox"/> other criteria
<input type="checkbox"/> Statements by Board				
<input type="checkbox"/> Statement by internal stakeholders				
<b>12) Quality of reports (corporate/central level)</b> <b>Please specify assessment rubric(s) the function uses to assess evaluation quality<sup>1</sup>: Recent = last 2-3 years</b>	Report quality is variable. Some recent reports are of low quality.	Report quality is variable. Very few recent reports of low quality, most reports are of average quality.	Report quality is consistent, all recent reports attain a good level of quality. A few recent reports are of very high quality	Report quality is consistent, all reports attain a high level of quality. A few recent reports are of outstanding quality.

1. Rubrics may include UNEG Report quality checklist, OIOS Evaluation Dashboard, UNICEF GEROS, UNDP QA etc.

#### **Norm 4 - Independence**

‘Independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility, influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process. The independence of the evaluation function comprises two key aspects: behavioural independence and organizational independence. Behavioural independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence by any party. Evaluators must have 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. The independence of the evaluation function underpins the free access to information that evaluators should have on their evaluation subject.

Organisational 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 the adequate resources to conduct its work. Organisational 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 organisation’s governing body or its executive head. Independence is vested in the Evaluation Head to directly commission, produce, public and disseminate duly quality-assured reports in the public domain without undue influence by any party’

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>13) Positioning of the central evaluation function in the organization</b>	There is no central evaluation unit.	Unit is embedded within management functions such as programme monitoring, policy development, the design and implementation of programmes.	Unit is separate from programme management functions, but the evaluation Head reports to a Programme Manager not the Executive Head/Director.	Unit is located outside the office of the Executive head and management. It is independent of decision-making and implementation and with a direct reporting line to relevant governing bodies. OR Unit is separate from functions AND is located in or under the office of the Executive Head/Director and with an agreed reporting line to relevant governing bodies. programme management
<b>14) Development and issuance of evaluation reports: Independence of the Head of evaluation (Head of Oversight if applicable)</b>	The Head of Evaluation does not have full discretion over the development and issuance of evaluation reports to Member States and the public. The Management Response is not attached.	The Head of Evaluation has some discretion over the development and issuance of evaluation reports. Reports have to be cleared internally before issuance to Member States and the public. There is potential for interference by management. The Management Response is not attached.	The Head of Evaluation has significant discretion over the development and issuance of evaluation reports. However, they have to be cleared by the Head of the Organization before issuance to Member States and the public. There are few or no risks of interference. The Management Response is attached.	The Head of Evaluation has full discretion over the development and issuance of evaluation reports to Member States and the public. The Management Response is attached. The Head of Evaluation interacts directly with Member States in deliberations over reports. There are no risks of interference.
<b>15) Planning of the evaluation Work programme (PoW)</b>	The Head of Evaluation does not have full discretion over the evaluation PoW. There are no safeguards for independence.	The Head of Evaluation has some discretion over the evaluation PoW. It is approved by the Head of the Organization. There are potential violations of independence.	The Head of Evaluation has significant discretion over the evaluation PoW. It is approved by the Head of the Organization. There are safeguards for independence and no violations of independence.	The Head of Evaluation has full discretion over the evaluation PoW. It is approved by the Governing Body. There are safeguards against external pressures/ influences and no violations of independence.
<b>16) Access to information</b>	There is no formal requirement for staff of the organization to provide evaluators with full access to information.	There is a formal requirement for access to information. Staff respect this. However, there are often difficulties in obtaining full access to people or information.	There is a formal requirement for access to information. Staff respect this. However, there are sometimes difficulties in obtaining full access to people or information.	There is a formal requirement for access to information. All staff respect this and there are no obstacles to obtaining information.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>17) Regular reporting to Member States on evaluation</b>	The Annual / periodic report is not considered by Member States.	The Head of Evaluation issues the Annual / periodic Report to Member States via another unit or the Head of the Organization.	The Head of Evaluation issues the Annual / periodic report directly to Member States. However, information on evaluation is limited and is mixed with other functions e.g. audit. It does not provide a comprehensive overview of evaluation in the organization for decision-making.	The Head of Evaluation issues the Annual / periodic report directly to Member States. It provides a separate and comprehensive overview of evaluation in the organization for decision- making.

## Norm 5 - Impartiality

‘The key elements of impartiality are objectivity, professional integrity and absence of bias. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including planning an evaluation, formulating the mandate and the scope, selecting the evaluation team, providing access to stakeholders, conducting the evaluation and formulating findings and recommendations.

Evaluators need to be impartial, implying that evaluation team members must not have been (or expect to be in the near future) directly responsible for the policy setting, design or management of the evaluation subject’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>18) Controls and mechanisms for stakeholder engagement and balanced perspectives / impartiality</b>	There are no controls or mechanisms to promote impartiality in place.	The unit uses only 1-2 controls/ approaches in the footnoted list (a-f).	The unit frequently uses some (>3). of these controls/approaches (a-f)	The unit uses a full variety of controls / approaches (>4) (a-f)
<b>19) Role of staff across the organization</b>	The unit can cite numerous examples whereby staff have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards.	The unit can cite a few examples whereby staff have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards.	Staff abide by accepted norms, standards and guidelines examples of undue influence on the evaluation process are rare.	Staff fully abide by all accepted norms, standards and guidelines Their performance / behaviour is exemplary. There are no known cases of undue influence on evaluation processes.
<b>20) Role of Governing Bodies</b>	None The unit can cite numerous examples whereby Member States have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards.	Low The unit can cite a few examples whereby Member States have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards.	Moderate Member States abide by accepted norms, standards examples of undue influence on the evaluation process are rare.	There are no known cases of undue influence on evaluation processes.

The extent to which an evaluation entity is promoting impartiality in its evaluation exercises can be judged using the following criteria:

- use of consultants to provide impartial expertise;
- use of evaluation management/reference/independent advisory groups;
- external readers to vouch for impartiality in the conduct of the evaluation exercise;

- formal endorsement of the report by evaluation management/reference/independent advisory groups or external readers;
- periodic meetings with stakeholders and transparency regarding the evaluation process;
- audit trail of all sources of information including interview notes and comments and suggestions made on draft reports;
- others (please specify)

### **Norm 6 - Ethics**

‘Evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the ‘do no harm’ principle for humanitarian assistance. Evaluators must respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, must ensure that sensitive data is protected and that it cannot be traced to its source and must validate statements made in the report with those who provided the relevant information. Evaluators should obtain informed consent for the use of private information from those who provide it. When evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, it must be reported discreetly to a competent body (such as the relevant office of audit or investigation).’

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)</b>	<b>Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)</b>	<b>Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)</b>	<b>Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)</b>
<b>21) Systems are in place to ensure respect of the four UNEG guiding ethical principles for evaluation: integrity, accountability, respect and beneficence</b>	No systems are in place.	Some consideration to ethical principles in evaluation work but they are not systematically respected in evaluation design and conduct.	Systems are in place with respect for the majority of ethical principles in evaluation design and conduct. Some principles are not adequately covered.	Systems are in place with full respect of the principles in evaluation design and conduct.

### **Norm 7 - Transparency**

‘Transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability. Evaluation products should be publicly accessible’.

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)</b>	<b>Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)</b>	<b>Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)</b>	<b>Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)</b>
<b>22) Systems are in place to ensure transparent processes of evaluation and design and conduct</b>	No systems are in place.	Systems are in place for transparent evaluation design and conduct but not respected systematically.	Systems are in place with some respect of the principles of transparent evaluation design and conduct in practice.	Systems are in place with full respect of the principles of transparent evaluation design and conduct in practice.
<b>23) Accessibility and transparency of completed evaluation reports</b>	Reports are not available on the website, either intra- or public website.	Reports are only available on the intranet.	Reports are available on the intranet, and some on the public website.	Reports are systematically uploaded onto the public website when finalised.

## Norm 8 - Human rights and gender equality

‘The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality needs to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to ‘leaving no one behind’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>24) Human rights (HR) and gender equality values are respected, addressed and promoted in support of the principle of ‘leaving no one behind’</b>	Gender, HR and diversity perspectives are not considered in evaluation work leading to a rating of ‘missing requirements’ in the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN SWAP) exercise.	Gender, HR and diversity are considered to some extent, but not systematically across all evaluation work, leading to a rating of ‘approaches requirements’ in the UN SWAP exercise.	Gender, HR and diversity are considered in a systematic way throughout the evaluation process by a balanced/diverse team leading to a rating of ‘meets requirements’ in the UN SWAP exercise.	Gender, HR and diversity are considered in a systematic way across all evaluation work by a balanced/ diverse team. Different approaches are used for different groups when required and this is reflected in evaluation, processes findings, conclusions and recommendations. This leads to a rating of ‘exceeds requirements’ in the UN SWAP exercise.

## Norm 9 - National evaluation capacities

‘The effective use of evaluation can make valuable contributions to accountability and learning and thereby justify actions to strengthen national evaluation capacities. In line with General Assembly Resolution A/RES/69/237 on building capacity for the evaluation of development activities at the country level, national evaluation capacities should be supported upon the request of Member States.’

National Evaluation Capacity Development (NECD)		
Is there an organisational mandate for NECD?	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Has the function formally articulated that it will engage in NECD?	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
If ‘No’, has the function formally articulated why it will NOT engage in NECD	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Is a mandate for NECD expressed in the evaluation policy?	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Is there a vision and integrated strategy and /or work plan for NECD?	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Select activities as appropriate:</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Engaging perspectives of nationals (including experts and institutions) in the conduct of evaluations	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Including nationals in reference groups and advisory panels	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluations led by national experts or institutions	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conduct of NECD training events	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others (please specify) _____	

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
25) NECD	There is no consideration of NECD in any formal documentation regarding the evaluation function.	Consideration of the function's position regarding NECD is presented in evaluation documents but not mentioned in the evaluation policy. Some initiatives are taken on an ad hoc basis.	Adoption of NECD mandates and respect of UNEG Norm on national evaluation capacity development. Policy statement on NECD, but not integrated in the work. Initiatives taken on a regular basis. OR A clear well-argued rationale for the evaluation function's approach and level of engagement in NECD is articulated in formal documentation (can take the form of an articulation of why NECD is not being operationalized).	Full adoption of an NECD mandate. The Unit has a policy statement, strategy and workplan for NECD. Initiatives are an integral part of the work.

### **Norm 10 - Professionalism**

‘Evaluations should be conducted with professionalism and integrity. Professionalism should contribute towards the credibility of evaluators, evaluation managers and evaluation heads, as well as the evaluation function. Key aspects include access to knowledge; education and training; adherence to ethics and to these norms and standards; utilization of evaluation competencies; and recognition of knowledge, skills and experience. This should be supported by an enabling environment, institutional structures and adequate resources’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
26) Staff competencies	Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations do not have core evaluation competencies; have little professional and managerial experience; and have limited understanding of organizational and institutional issues.	Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations have relevant technical evaluation expertise as per the UNEG competency framework, but have limited professional and managerial experience, and complementary knowledge (including limited understanding of organizational and institutional issues).	Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations have sound technical expertise, as per the UNEG competency framework, solid professional experience, and a range of other complementary knowledge and skills (including managerial skills if managing consultants, etc.). They have a good understanding of organizational and institutional issues.	Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations have extensive technical competencies, solid professional experience, and strong complementary knowledge and skills (including strong managerial skills if managing consultants, etc.). They apply innovative knowledge and skills to advance evaluation methodology. They have an excellent understanding of organizational and institutional issues.
27) Consultant competencies	There are no mechanisms in	External consultants meet the defined	External consultants meet/surpass the defined	External consultants meet/surpass the defined

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
	place to ensure that professional / technical standards are met by all consultants.	levels of content and professional expertise required. Evaluation experts partially meet the UNEG evaluation competency standards (Standard 3.1- 3.2). Mechanisms to ensure that professional/ technical standards are met by all consultants.	levels of content and professional expertise required. Evaluation experts meet the UNEG evaluation competency standards (Standard 3.1-3.2). There are mechanisms to ensure that professional/ technical standards are met by all consultants, but these are not always effective.	levels of content and professional expertise required, and have solid professional experience. Thematic experts are familiar with evaluation principles and methodologies. Effective mechanisms are in place to ensure that professional/ technical standards are met by all consultants.
<b>28) Respect by evaluators and managers of evaluations of accepted elements of the practice of evaluation</b>	None There are numerous examples whereby evaluators and evaluation managers have not abided by accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics, integrity and cultural sensitivity. The examples are recurrent.	Low There are a few examples whereby evaluators and evaluation managers have not abided by accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics, integrity and cultural sensitivity.	Moderate Evaluators and evaluation managers usually abide by accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics, integrity and cultural sensitivity. There are infrequent exceptions.	High Evaluators and evaluation managers fully abide by all accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics, integrity and cultural sensitivity. Their performance / behaviour is exemplary. There are no known cases whereby these norms and standards have been breached.
<b>29) Professional development of staff</b>	There are no opportunities for staff to enhance their evaluation skills and be trained on the latest evaluation methods.	There are ad hoc opportunities for some staff to enhance their evaluation skills and be trained on the latest evaluation methods.	There are clear policies, and opportunities for all staff to enhance their evaluation skills and be trained on the latest evaluation methods.	There are clear policies and all staff engage in multiple opportunities for learning and sharing (including training, publications, presentations in conferences and sharing of knowledge and skills by delivering training).
<b>30) Participation in UNEG</b>	Not a member.	Member of UNEG but not active in work groups. Unit uses UNEG products.	Member of UNEG and active in work groups. Unit uses UNEG products.	Member of UNEG and active in driving the work of UNEG. Unit actively uses and promotes use of UNEG products.
<b>31) Absence of bias by evaluators and managers of evaluation</b>	Evaluation managers and evaluators are not formally required to reduce bias in evaluations.	Evaluation managers and evaluators are formally required to reduce bias and errors in the design	Evaluation managers and evaluators are formally required to reduce bias and errors in the design and conduct evaluation using	Evaluation managers and evaluators are formally required to reduce bias and errors in the design and conduct of evaluation using professional/technical

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
		and conduct evaluation but there are no instructions / guidelines on how to do so.	professional/technical standards. There are instructions / guidelines on how to do so.	standards. There are instructions/guidelines on how to do so and these are applied consistently across the unit.

## PART B - INSTITUTIONAL NORMS

### Norm 11 - Enabling environment

‘Evaluation requires an enabling environment that includes an organizational culture that values evaluation as a basis for accountability, learning and evidence-based decision-making; a firm commitment from organizational leadership to use, publicise and follow up on evaluation outcomes; and recognition of evaluation as a key corporate function for achieving results and public accountability. Creating an enabling environment also entails providing predictable and adequate resources to the evaluation function’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>32) Evaluation architecture</b>	Evaluation is not formally undertaken. An architecture for evaluation is non-existent or not defined.	Architecture for evaluation is partially articulated. Linkages to decentralised evaluation arrangements (where they exist) other oversight, monitoring and/or performance reporting functions are made to some extent but are not fully operational.	Architecture for evaluation is well articulated. Linkages to decentralised evaluation arrangements (where they exist), other oversight, monitoring and/or performance reporting functions are made and are operational but not fully embedded / integrated in systems and Standard Operating Procedures.	Architecture for evaluation is well articulated. Linkages to decentralised evaluation arrangements (where they exist), other oversight, monitoring and/or performance reporting functions are fully operational, embedded and effective.
<b>33) Governance structure</b> * Legislative * Management * Evaluation	The governance structure for evaluation is not defined. Governing bodies are not active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas never	The governance structure for evaluation is defined. In practice the roles and responsibilities of legislative/ governing bodies and senior management are unclear. There are no guidelines or	The roles and responsibilities of legislative/ governing bodies and senior management are clearly defined. There are guidelines/ operational directives. Governing bodies are quite active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas regularly feature	The governance structure for evaluation is effective. The roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. Legislative/ governing bodies and senior management play a key role in strengthening and promoting an evaluation culture. Governing bodies are very active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
	feature evaluation topics or issues.	operational directives. Governing bodies are occasionally active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas occasionally feature evaluation topics or issues.	evaluation topics or issues.	Governing Body meeting agendas always feature evaluation topics or issues. There are different and specific structures in place regularly looking at evaluation. e.g. a dedicated committee on oversight / evaluation issues
<b>34) Support to decentralised/ self/management-led evaluations functions by the central evaluation unit</b>	There is no support to decentralised or technical evaluation functions by the central evaluation unit.	Support to decentralised or technical evaluation functions by the central evaluation unit is recognised as important but is limited. There is no well-defined strategy of how the central unit can support or enhance the quality of decentralised evaluation, nor clear guidelines for the decentralized evaluation function.	Support to decentralised or technical evaluation functions by the central evaluation unit is good. There is a clear understanding of decentralised evaluation and its role in the evaluation architecture. Guidelines or manuals for decentralised evaluations have been produced and disseminated. Linkages and alignments are being established between the central and decentralised functions.	The central evaluation unit provides extensive support to decentralised or technical evaluation functions. There are guidelines/ manuals and/or strategy/ for decentralised or technical evaluations. The central and decentralised/technical evaluation functions are well-defined and linked/aligned.
<b>35) System wide harmonization, collaboration, coherence and efficiency</b>	There is no coordination or collaboration with other UN organizations in the conduct of evaluations.	Coordination with other UN organizations is limited to sharing of information. There is no collaboration	There is active coordination and some collaboration with other UN organizations. Evaluation plans and activities are systematically shared with other UN organizations.	The unit is active in UN reform and harmonization, and demonstrates excellent coordination and collaboration.

### **Norm 12 - Evaluation policy**

‘Every organization should establish an explicit evaluation policy. Taking into account the specificities of the organisation’s requirements, the evaluation policy should include a clear explanation of the purpose, concepts, rules and use of evaluation within the organization; the institutional framework and roles and responsibilities; measures to safeguard evaluation independence and public accountability; benchmarks for financing the evaluation function that are commensurate with the size of function of the organization; measures to ensure the quality and use of evaluations and post-evaluation follow up; a framework for decentralized evaluations, where applicable; and provisions for periodic peer review or external assessment. The evaluation policy should be approved by the governing body and/or the executive head to ensure it has

a formally recognized status at the highest levels of the organization. References to evaluators in the policy should encompass staff of the evaluation function as well as evaluation consultants’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<p><b>36) Appropriate Evaluation Policy in place including clear mandate from governing/legislative bodies (see <a href="#">attributes</a> below)</b></p>	<p>There is no clear mandate for evaluation.</p> <p>There is no Evaluation Policy and little or no codification of practices.</p>	<p>There is a formal mandate for evaluation.</p> <p>The Evaluation Policy recognizes the adoption of the <i>UNEG Norms &amp; Standards</i> exist, but does not sufficiently cover the UNEG criteria a – c for an Evaluation Policy.</p>	<p>There is a clear mandate for evaluation and the Evaluation Policy articulates what it covers and its purpose. However, it does not link evaluation to the rest of the organization (approval and follow up mechanisms).</p> <p>The Evaluation Policy covers UNEG criteria a to c and most of d to l, and it describes how the organization will adapt the UNEG Norms &amp; Standards to fit the organization.</p>	<p>The mandate for the evaluation function is strong. The Evaluation Policy clearly includes reference to all UNEG attributes mentioned below (a – i) as well as other good practices (j-t) as relevant.</p> <p>The Policy extensively describes adaptation of the UNEG Norms &amp; Standards, and inclusion of other norms to fit the context of the organization.</p>
<p><b>37) Strategy for evaluation and support from senior management for evaluation</b></p>	<p>There is no organizational strategy for evaluation.</p> <p>Senior management leadership and support for the evaluation function is missing; there is no evaluation culture nor understanding of the added value of evaluation</p>	<p>There is an organizational strategy for evaluation which operationalizes the evaluation policy.</p> <p>There is a results framework (with some indicators, of variable quality) for evaluation.</p> <p>There is some understanding on the part of senior management of the added value of evaluation.</p> <p>There are a few ‘champions’ who promote the function.</p>	<p>There is an organizational strategy for evaluation which operationalizes the evaluation policy. It specifies the role of evaluation and what will make the evaluation function effective/efficient, have impact and be sustainable.</p> <p>There is a results framework (with a full set of indicators of variable quality) for evaluation.</p> <p>Most senior managers understand the role and added value of evaluation, and there are several ‘champions’ who promote the function.</p>	<p>There is an organizational strategy for evaluation which operationalizes the evaluation policy. It clearly specifies the role of evaluation and what will make the evaluation function effective/efficient, have impact and be sustainable.</p> <p>There is an articulated theory of change for the organisation, supported by a results framework (with a comprehensive set of SMART indicators) for evaluation.</p> <p>Senior management fully understand the role and added value of evaluation, and actively support and promote the function within the organization.</p>

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>38) Supporting guidelines and/or structures<sup>2</sup></b>	There are no guidelines / documents or structures in place for implementation of the Policy.	There are some guidelines / documents and structures in place for implementation. However, they do not refer to key aspects of the policy (i.e. UNEG attributes for an evaluation policy [a – d] in criterion 31).	There are many guidelines / documents and structures in place for implementation. They refer to selective aspects of the policy [> 4 attributes including a-d].	There are documents and structures in place for implementation. They are comprehensive and cover all aspects of good practice for the policy.
<b>39) Monitoring of policy implementation and revision of the policy</b>	There is no policy.	A policy exists but its implementation is not monitored. There is no plan to review or update the policy and have it formally approved.	There is ad hoc monitoring of policy implementation (e.g. the monitoring of performance indicators and some level of reporting to senior management or governing bodies). The policy is updated on this basis and formally approved.	There is on-going monitoring of policy implementation. Adjustments are made regularly (policy revised at least every 5 years) on the basis of: An assessment of implementation, evolving norms and standards, organizational changes, new demands and views of stakeholders.
<b>40) Continuous assessment of the fulfilment of the policy/ norms and standards</b>	No initiatives taken for a continuous assessment of the fulfilment of the policy/ norms and standards [independence, credibility, utility]	Few ad hoc initiatives are undertaken. Adaptation and the change process is slow. Unit is focused on mechanical implementation issues rather than broad, strategic ones.	Several initiatives are undertaken periodically as part of the annual work plan. Adaptation and change is on-going. The Unit occasionally reviews and / or improves evaluation guidelines and manuals	Initiatives are undertaken on a regular basis. Adaptation and change is an integral part of the work of the unit. Frequent and regular review and / or improvement of evaluation guidelines and manuals are undertaken.

**1. UNEG good practice for inclusion in policy:**

- a) The role of evaluation within the organization (purpose)
- b) The various types of evaluations applied within the organization (self, independent, centralised/ decentralised...)
- c) The difference between evaluation and other types of assessments carried out within the organization
- d) Definition of the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation professionals, senior management and program managers
- e) The need for adherence to the organization's evaluation guidelines
- f) How evaluations are prioritised and planned
- g) How evaluations are organized, managed and budgeted
- h) Management response for the follow up of evaluations
- i) Statement on disclosure and dissemination (see discussion under Resources (criteria 15-19); we might add another criterion here, (j) to read 'Statement on, or formula for costing the evaluation function.)

**Other good practices (as identified by JIU and OIOS):**

- j) Assesses value for the function. Adapts and adds policy elements as appropriate to the purpose, goal and requirements of evaluations
- k) Addresses a set of guiding principles/mandates/goals important for the organization mandate & structure of operation
- l) Defines roles for levels of governance in evaluation (Governing Body, Management; Evaluation)
- m) Defines independence in inclusive manner (structural, built-in structural, professional/technical, behavioural) as a means of achieving impartiality

2. Refers to guidelines / documents not produced by the Evaluation Office e.g. Results-Based Management manual and / or guidance material, project / programme manuals, project / programme appraisal or review committees.

### **Norm 13 - Responsibility for the evaluation function**

‘An organisation’s governing body and/or its executive head are responsible for the establishment of a duly independent, competent and adequately resourced evaluation function to serve its governance and management needs. The evaluation budget shall be commensurate to the size and function of the organization’.

The governing body and/or executive head are responsible for appointing a professionally competent head of evaluation and for fostering an enabling environment that allows the head of evaluation to plan, design, manage and conduct evaluation activities in line with the *UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation*. The governing body and/or the executive head are responsible for ensuring that evaluators, evaluation managers and the head of the evaluation function have the freedom to conduct their work without risking their career development. Management of the human and financial resources allocated to evaluation should lie with the head of evaluation in order to ensure that the evaluation function is staffed by professionals with evaluation competencies in line with the UNEG Competency Framework.

Where a decentralized evaluation function exists, the central evaluation function is responsible for establishing a framework that provides guidance, quality assurance, technical assistance and professionalization support’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>41) Appointment of Head of Evaluation (Head of Oversight if applicable)</b>	There is no central evaluation unit.	The appointment is made by the Head of the organization without consideration of UNEG evaluation competencies.	The appointment is made by the Head of the organization with consideration of UNEG evaluation competencies.	The appointment is made by the Governing/Legislative Board with consideration of UNEG evaluation competencies.
<b>42) Core resources<sup>1</sup></b>	There are no core resources to support staff dedicated to evaluation.	Human resources available for evaluation are shared with monitoring and/or other oversight activities. Support for staff positions is uncertain, unstable and / or unsustainable. Transaction costs are incurred in mobilizing resources.	There are clear dedicated staff resources for evaluation but funding to support staff positions can be unstable and/or unsustainable. Transaction costs sometimes incurred in mobilizing resources..	There are clear/separate dedicated staff resources for evaluation which are stable and sustainable. Core resources are commensurate with requirements for comprehensive evaluation coverage of the organization. Resources for evaluation support a function which is

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
				proactive and focused on refining itself.
<b>43) Non-core/ extra budgetary financial resources</b>	The evaluation function is highly dependent on non-core/extra budgetary resources, and there are no measures in place to (a) safeguard independence and (b) ensure sustainability of the function.	The evaluation function is highly dependent on non-core/extra budgetary resources and there are few measures in place to (a) safeguard independence and (b) ensure sustainability of the function (ensure use aligned with organizational mandate or needs of unit).	The evaluation function is not solely dependent on non-core resources, and there are adequate measures in place to (a) safeguard independence and (b) ensure financial sustainability of the function.	The evaluation function benefits from adequate non-core resources for its operations. There are strong measures in place to (a) safeguard independence and (b) ensure sustainability of the function. Non-core resources are managed at the discretion of the unit Head. The unit effectively mobilises and uses non-core resources to strengthen its programme of work.
<b>44) Results-based Management (RBM) framework</b>	The organization does not have an operational RBM policy or system. The overall organizational culture for results and accountability / learning is poor.	An RBM policy / system exists and is operational. Linkages (among evaluation, strategy, budget, programmatic areas, etc.) are not well defined. Implementation of RBM is not complete (results-based reporting is not comprehensive). The organizational culture for results and accountability / learning depends on individuals.	The RBM policy/system exists and its implementation/ coverage is more or less complete. It provides some key elements to support the conduct of evaluation (logical framework, results, performance indicators, reporting and data systems are of high quality) but evaluation is not fully integrated into the system (the linkages are not well/fully developed). The organizational culture for results and accountability / learning is only partially reflected in the organization's practices. There are occasional capacity building initiatives for enhancing the organizational culture.	The RBM policy/system exists and its implementation / coverage is comprehensive. It provides all key elements to support the conduct of evaluation (logical framework, results, performance indicators, reporting and data systems are of high quality). Evaluation is fully integrated into the system (the linkages are well/fully developed) and its role (advisory or other) defined. The organizational culture for results and accountability / learning is fully reflected in the organization's practices. There are systematic capacity building initiatives for enhancing the organizational culture.
<b>45) Planning for coverage (see <a href="#">criteria</a> below)</b>	Evaluations are not planned and prioritized according to clear selection criteria.	Evaluations are planned but the selection criteria are unclear and/or not systematically applied.	Evaluations are planned and prioritized according to clear selection criteria.	Evaluations are planned and prioritized according to clear and strategic selection criteria. They allow for flexibility and maximum coverage.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>46) Actual coverage and responsiveness of the plan</b>	Coverage is ad hoc. Few areas are covered on a selective basis. The plan is inflexible to respond to changing conditions and demands.	Coverage is weak and selective. The plan is somewhat flexible but mostly focuses on own internal capacity and limited resources. Not sure how supportive of decision-making the plan is. >50% of substantive* areas are covered within a 5-year period but on a selective basis. (* themes or topics deemed as key priorities within the organization's approved programme of work.)	Coverage is adequate and the plan is adaptable. The plan supports demand and decision-making at various levels of the organization. It recognizes the need for balancing various activities. >75% of substantive areas are covered within a 5- year period.	Coverage is good/excellent. The plan is flexible to changing conditions and demands and is supported by a strategy for doing so. It is clearly linked to demands and decision-making at various levels of the organization. 100% of substantive areas are covered within a 5-year period.
<b>47) Technical and managerial evaluation guidelines and tools</b>	No evaluation guidelines or tools are available.	There are few evaluation guidelines and tools. Those that exist are not comprehensive nor are they not applied consistently across the organization.	There are evaluation guidelines and tools, covering key areas. They are applied somewhat consistently across the organization.	There is a comprehensive set of evaluation guidelines and tools which are applied consistently across the organization.

1. Core refers to resources coming from an organization's regular/central budget, as compared to extrabudgetary resources from specific donor agreements (non-core).

The following planning/selection criteria are used (check as applicable):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Organization strategic plan / priorities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal and external stakeholder demand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Emerging / global trends
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal and external coherence
<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluability assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Funding amount
<input type="checkbox"/>	Up-scaling value
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others (please specify) Yes _____

**Norm 14 - Evaluation use and follow-up**

‘Organisations should promote evaluation use and follow up, using an interactive process that involves all stakeholders. Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and/or management

addressed by its recommendations that clearly states responsibilities and accountabilities. Management should integrate evaluation results and recommendations into its policies and programmes.

The implementation of the evaluation recommendations should be systematically followed up. A periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations should be presented to the governing bodies and/or the head of the organisation’.

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>48) Recommendation tracking system</b>	There is no follow-up mechanism.	Follow-up mechanisms are in place and there is ad hoc follow-up on the implementation of recommendations.	Follow-up mechanisms are in place and well designed. There is systematic follow-up on the implementation of recommendations.	The follow-up mechanism is well designed and of high quality. There is systematic follow-up of recommendations. Reporting on implementation status is mandated.
<b>49) Recommendation implementation rates</b>	There is no follow-up on the implementation of recommendations. There is no clear indication of recommendation accepted and implemented.	Less than 50% of recommendations are implemented within the first three years.	Between 50-85% of recommendations are implemented within the first three years.	More than 85% of recommendations are implemented within the first three years. The evaluation function assesses implementation of recommendations and the results achieved as a result of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations
<b>Nature of use for central evaluation reports (check as applicable):</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/>	High level – For developing corporate strategies and policies for strategic decision-making in the organization by the governing/legislative bodies and senior management			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mid-level – For management and broader programmatic decisions by senior and mid-level management			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation level – For on-going adjustments at project and programme level by project and programme managers			
<b>High Level</b> <b>50) Corporate/summative use (use for strategic direction setting at organizational level)</b>	Not used	Low use	Moderate use	High use
<b>Mid Level</b>	Not used	Low use	Moderate use	High use

Factor	Level 1 (Rating of 1-2)	Level 2 (Rating of 3-4)	Level 3 (Rating of 5-6)	Level 4 (Rating of 7-8)
<b>51) Corporate/ summative use</b> (use for strategic direction setting at higher programmatic level; tied to performance)		A few evaluations have been used as input for the development or revision of the organization's programme of work or thematic strategies.	Some evaluations have been used as input for the development or revision of the organization's programme of work or thematic strategies.	All evaluations are used as input for the development or revision of the organization's programme of work or thematic strategies.
<b>Implementation Level</b> <b>52) Formative use for on-going adjustments at project and programme level for programmatic improvement and learning</b> – what is working, what changes to make, etc. (during interventions)	Not used	Low use	Average use	High use
<b>53) External use of evaluation</b>	Evaluations are never cited outside the organization.	Evaluations are rarely cited outside the organization.	Evaluations are occasionally cited outside the organization.	Evaluations are often cited outside the organization.

## Annex 1. Assessment criteria mapped to the structure of the JIU evaluation maturity matrix

Demand and Intentionality	
The Enabling Environment – Organizational and Institutional Framework for Evaluation and its Adequacy in Responding to Demand	
Evaluation Architecture	27
Governance	28
Mandate, Vision and Policy	31,32,34
Supporting implementation of the policy	33
Resources	37,38
Results and accountability/Learning culture	39
Relevance, Responsiveness, Efficiency and Adaptability	
Relevance to stakeholder demands and Coverage	29, 40,41
Responsiveness to UN Reform, NECD, Global challenges, Gender, and Human Rights	19, 20,25,30
Efficiency	
Adaptability and Continuous improvement	6,35
Credibility: Impartiality and Balanced Perspectives (Independence, Inclusion and Stakeholder Involvement)	
Structural Independence and Head of Evaluation	36
Functional Independence– Planning, Management and Delivery of output	
Built in mechanisms for impartiality	16*,42
Professional/Technical Independence	8,26
Behavioural Independence	14, 15,23
Credibility: Validity and Reliability (Technical Quality)	
Evaluators and Evaluation Teams: Staff and consultant quality	9,11,21,22,24
Conditions in place to ensure quality and consistency in the application of standards and approaches	10,12,13
Utility and Potential Impact	
Conditions in place to enhance use	2,3,4,5,18,43
Outcome Level : Nature and level of use	44,45,46,47,48
Impact level: Effect of use	7
Direction setting / Reflections on the Evaluation Function Moving Forward	

## Annex 2. Matrix Checklist<sup>2</sup>

### Part A: General Norms for Evaluation

#### Evaluation Norm 1: Internationally Agreed Principles, Goals and Targets

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
1. Extent to which evaluation managers are upholding and promoting the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed and, in particular, the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development	1. Evaluation managers and evaluators show very little or no consideration of 2030 goals and targets in their work. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Consideration of 2030 goals and targets evident to a limited extent in the work of evaluation managers and evaluators but the evaluation function is focused mostly internally on their own development and immediate needs. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Evaluation managers and evaluators promote and consider 2030 goals and targets global trends and challenges in planning /coverage, joint work and methodology for complex evaluands and contexts. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Evaluation managers and evaluators promote, consider and make contributions to the 2030 goals and targets. The function demonstrates it is fully cognizant of global trends and challenges. The function is seeking new approaches and partnerships and revising old partnerships for cognitive diversity and new imperatives. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

<sup>2</sup> A word version of this Checklist is also available.

## Evaluation Norm 2: Utility

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
2. Timeliness in meeting stakeholder demands	1. There is no work plan/set schedule for evaluations <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Evaluations are rarely completed within the set schedule nor readily feed into decision-making processes. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Evaluations are often completed within the set schedule and usually planned to feed into decision-making processes. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Evaluations are always completed within the set schedule and regularly feed into decision-making processes. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
3. Dissemination and communication strategy	1. There is no dissemination and no communication strategy. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. There is some dissemination, but it is not organized or systematic. There is no communication strategy. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There is a clear dissemination and communication strategy. Dissemination is well-organized and systematic. Standard approaches are used but not differentiated by audience. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. There is a clear dissemination and communication strategy, it is fully resourced and communication / dissemination approaches are differentiated by audience. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
4. Sharing of evaluation results internally	1. Evaluations results are not distributed or are distributed to only a limited internal audience. There are no established networks and systems for internal lessons learning and discussions. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Evaluations results are occasionally distributed internally and reach most internal audiences. There are few networks and systems for internal lessons learning and discussions, but these have not yet been institutionalized. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Evaluations results are regularly distributed internally, they reach a broad internal audience and are discussed with management. There are several networks and systems for internal lessons learning and discussions; they are partly institutionalized. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Evaluations results are systematically distributed across the organization internally and discussed with management. Briefs and notes on lessons or innovations are developed and shared. There are continuous formal and informal meetings with stakeholders on evaluation findings and recommendations. Networks and systems for internal lessons learning and Knowledge Management are well established and functioning effectively <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback	
5. Sharing of evaluation results externally	1. Evaluations results and lessons learned are not shared or are rarely shared with other UN organizations and external stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Evaluations results and lessons learned are sometimes shared with other UN organizations and external stakeholders. The unit participates (on an ad hoc basis) in some external networks and systems for lessons learning and discussions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Evaluations results and lessons learned are shared with other UN organizations. The unit participates in some external networks and systems for lessons learning and discussions. It sometimes makes presentations about its work via UNEG and/or to external stakeholders (including other evaluators, Members States beneficiaries, professional networks etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Evaluations results and lessons learned are regularly and systematically shared with other UN organizations and external stakeholders (including other evaluators, Members States, beneficiaries, etc.). The unit participates in several external networks and systems for LL and discussions. It regularly makes presentations about its work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
6. Contributions to advancing evaluation in the context of the UN system's work beyond UNEG	1. No initiatives <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Few, ad hoc initiatives undertaken. Reflections being made. Participates in forums and learning about advances. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Several initiatives undertaken periodically as part of annual work plan. Partially engaged and making a contribution. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Initiatives undertaken on a regular basis. Making a visible contribution and sharing innovations. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
7. Effect of evaluation use on organizational effectiveness and evidence of impact	1. There is no evidence or examples of the effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. There are a few examples showing effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There are many examples showing effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. There is a comprehensive set of evidence of collected that shows significant impact of the effect of use of evaluations on organizational effectiveness. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

### Evaluation Norm 3: Credibility

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
8. Professional integrity and Identity of the function	1. None <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Low: < 4 elements apply <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Moderate: 4 to 7 elements apply <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. High >7 elements apply <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
9. Methodologies and types of evaluation	1. Little consideration of best-suited methods or types of evaluation. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Some consideration given to the application of different methods and types of evaluations, but the evaluation function is limited in what it can do. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. The evaluation function applies a range of different methods and undertakes various types of evaluation. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. The evaluation function applies a wide range of different methods and undertakes various types of evaluation. It generates innovations in methodology and contributes to progress in the field. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
10. Controls and stakeholder engagement at various stages of the evaluation	1. There are no controls in place. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The evaluation function uses only 1-3 of these controls. They are systematically and consistently used. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
to ensure quality / content validity	3. The evaluation function frequently uses a number of these controls (>3). These are systematically and consistently used. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. The evaluation function always uses a variety of controls and stakeholder involvement (>5). These are systematically and consistently used. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
11. Empirical/objective assessments of evaluation reports and compliance with N&S and other requirements	1. The quality of evaluation reports has not been assessed. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. There are ad hoc assessments of the quality of reports. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There are regular assessments of the quality of reports (> every 2 years) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. There are regular independent external assessments of the quality of reports (at least every 2 years) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
12. Quality of reports (corporate/central level) Please specify assessment rubric(s) the function uses to assess evaluation quality Recent = last 2-3 years	1. Report quality is variable. Some recent reports are of low quality. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Report quality is variable. Very few recent reports of low quality, most reports are of average quality. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Report quality is consistent, all recent reports attain a good level of quality. A few recent reports are of very high quality <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
	4. Report quality is consistent, all reports attain a high level of quality. A few recent reports are of outstanding quality.	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Elements of professional integrity and identity present (check as applicable):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	There is independence but not isolation. There is engagement by the evaluation entity with the organization through clearly defined processes throughout the evaluation design and management cycle.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluation is not overshadowed by other disciplines or made compliant to other related disciplines (monitoring, research, audit, assessments etc.), thus not fulfilling its value added.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff managing and conducting evaluation have training and experience in managing and conducting evaluations (on top of other disciplines) in line with the <a href="#">UNEG Evaluation Competency Framework</a> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	Function has prominence or standing in the organization and with the governing bodies, for example, via regular peer review or external review exercises of the function, and independent quality assessment of evaluation reports.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Evaluations address both performance (“doing things right”) and addresses critical evaluation questions of “doing the right things”, and strategic direction setting and appropriate positioning of the organization for added value and advancement.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The approaches and methods used follow professional methods for evaluation in line with the Norms and Standards and appropriate quality assessment standards for evaluation reports.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The accountability for results objective is an integral part of the entity’s evaluation practice alongside an objective to support strategic learning and adaptive management. Evaluation methods ensure that evaluation findings seek to demonstrate directly attributable results as well as results that the organization is contributing to along with others.
<input type="checkbox"/>	When co-located, there is equivalent treatment with other functions in terms of resourcing, coverage, recognition, status and staffing.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The evaluation entity (Evaluation Office or Evaluation Unit) is recognized throughout the organization as an advocate for evaluation principles and is a respected custodian or steward of good UN evaluation practice.

Elements of controls and stakeholder engagement to ensure quality / content validity (check as applicable):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal quality assurance tools (based on evaluation norms and standards) at various stages of the evaluation (checklists, templates, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal peer review mechanisms
<input type="checkbox"/>	UNEG quality checklists
<input type="checkbox"/>	Expertise and mix of team members tailored to the evaluand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Use of consultants as evaluation and thematic experts
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reference / Advisory Groups made up of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Internal Experts</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Experts from other UN organizations</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Experts from outside the UN</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/>	External Readers or review mechanism
<input type="checkbox"/>	Formal endorsement of report by Reference / Advisory Groups or External Readers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Periodic meetings with stakeholders at various stages of the evaluation, validating the evaluating results
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)

Type of assessment (check as applicable):			
<input type="checkbox"/>	Internal assessment of reports on the basis of:	<input type="checkbox"/> UNEG Norms and Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> other criteria
<input type="checkbox"/>	External assessment of reports on the basis of:	<input type="checkbox"/> UNEG Norms and Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> other criteria
<input type="checkbox"/>	Statements by Board		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Statement by internal stakeholders		

### Evaluation Norm 4 – Independence

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
13. Positioning of the central evaluation function in the organization	1. There is no central evaluation unit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Unit is embedded within management functions such as programme monitoring, policy development, the design and implementation of programmes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Unit is separate from programme management functions, but the evaluation Head reports to a Programme Manager not the Executive Head/Director.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Unit is located outside the office of the Executive head and management. It is independent of decision-making and implementation and with a direct reporting line to relevant governing bodies. OR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	Unit is separate from programme management functions AND is located in or under the office of the Executive Head/Director and with an agreed reporting line to relevant governing bodies.			
14. Development and issuance of evaluation reports: Independence of the Head of evaluation (Head of Oversight if applicable)	1. The Head of Evaluation does not have full discretion over the development and issuance of evaluation reports to Member States and to the public. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The Head of Evaluation has some discretion over the development and issuance of evaluation reports. The reports have to be cleared internally before issuance to Member States and to the public. There is potential for interference by management. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. The Head of Evaluation has significant discretion over the development and issuance of evaluation reports. However, the reports have to be cleared by the Head of the Organization before issuance to Member States and to the public. There are few or no risks of interference. The Management Response is attached. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. The Head of Evaluation has full discretion over the development and issuance of <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>evaluation reports to Member States and to the public. The Management Response is attached.</p> <p>The Head of Evaluation interacts directly with Member States in deliberations over reports. There are no risks of interference.</p>			
15. Planning of the Evaluation Work Programme (PoW)	<p>1. The Head of Evaluation does not have full discretion over the evaluation PoW. There are no safeguards for independence.</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	<p>2. The Head of Evaluation has some discretion over the evaluation PoW. It is approved by the Head of the Organization. There are potential violations of independence.</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	<p>3. The Head of Evaluation has significant discretion over the evaluation PoW. It is approved by the Head of the Organization. There are safeguards for independence and no violations of independence.</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	<p>4. The Head of Evaluation has full discretion over the evaluation PoW. It is approved by the Governing Body. There are safeguards against external pressures/ influences and no violations of independence.</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
16. Access to information	<p>1. There is no formal requirement for staff of the organization to provide evaluators with full access to information.</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	2. There is a formal requirement for access to information. Staff respect this. However, there are often difficulties in obtaining full access to people or information. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There is a formal requirement for access to information. Staff respect this. However, there are sometimes difficulties in obtaining full access to people or information. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. There is a formal requirement for access to information. All staff respect this and there are no obstacles to obtaining information. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
17. Regular Report to Member States on evaluation	1. The Annual / periodic Report is not considered by Member States. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The Head of Evaluation issues the Annual / periodic Report to Member States via another unit or the Head of the Organization. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. The Head of Evaluation issues the Annual / periodic Report directly to Member States. However, information on evaluation is limited and is mixed with e.g., audit. It does not provide a comprehensive overview of evaluation in the organization for decision-making. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. The Head of Evaluation issues the Annual / periodic Report directly to Member States. It provides a separate and comprehensive <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
	overview of evaluation in the organization for decision- making.		

### Evaluation Norm 5 – Impartiality

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
18.Controls and mechanisms for stakeholder engagement and balanced perspectives / impartiality	1. There are no controls or mechanisms to promote impartiality in place. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The unit uses only 1-2 controls/ approaches in the footnoted list (a-f). <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. The unit frequently uses some (>3). of these controls/approaches (a-f) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. The unit uses a full variety of controls / approaches (>4) (a-f) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
19.Role of staff across the organization	1. The unit can cite numerous examples whereby staff have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The unit can cite a few examples whereby staff have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Staff abide by accepted norms, standards and guidelines examples of undue influence on the evaluation process are rare. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>4. Staff fully abide by all accepted norms, standards and guidelines</p> <p>Their performance / behaviour is exemplary. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>There are no known cases of undue influence on evaluation processes. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
20.Role of Governing Bodies	<p>1. None</p> <p>The unit can cite numerous examples whereby Member States have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	<p>2. Low</p> <p>The unit can cite a few examples whereby Member States have exerted some form of undue influence on the evaluation process, thereby not abiding by accepted norms and standards. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	<p>3. Moderate</p> <p>Member States abide by accepted norms, standards examples of undue influence on the evaluation process are rare. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	<p>4. High</p> <p>Member States fully abide by all accepted norms, standards and guidelines. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Their performance / behaviour is exemplary. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
	There are no known cases of undue influence on evaluation processes.		

### Evaluation Norm 6 – Ethics

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
21. Systems are in place to ensure respect of the four UNEG guiding ethical principles for evaluation: integrity, accountability, respect and beneficence	1. No systems in place <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Some consideration to ethical principles in evaluation work but they are not systematically respected in evaluation design and conduct <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Systems in place with respect for the majority of ethical principles in evaluation design and conduct. Some principles not adequately covered. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Systems in place with full respect of the principles in evaluation design and conduct. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

### Evaluation Norm 7 – Transparency

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
22. Systems in place to ensure transparent processes of evaluation and	1. No systems in place <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Systems are in place for transparent evaluation design and conduct but not respected systematically <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
design and conduct	3. Systems are in place with some respect of the principles of transparent evaluation design and conduct in practice <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Systems are in place with full respect of the principles of transparent evaluation design and conduct in practice <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
23. Accessibility and transparency of completed evaluation reports	1. Reports are not available on the website, either intra- or public website <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Reports are only available on the intranet. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Reports are available on the intranet, and some on the public website. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Reports are systematically uploaded onto the public website when finalized. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

### Evaluation Norm 8 – Human Rights and Gender Equality

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
24. Human rights and gender equality values are respected, addressed and promoted in support of the principle of	1. Gender and human rights and diversity perspectives are not considered in evaluation work leading to a rating of ‘missing requirements’ in the UN System-Wide Action Plan exercise. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Gender, HR and diversity considered to some extent, but this not systematically across all evaluation work, leading to a <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
'leaving no one behind'	rating of 'approaches requirements' in the UN System-Wide Action Plan exercise.			
	3. Gender, HR and diversity considered in a systematic way throughout the evaluation process by a balanced/diverse team leading to a rating of 'meets requirements' in the UN System-Wide Action Plan exercise. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Gender, HR and diversity considered in a systematic way across all evaluation work by a balanced/ diverse team. Different approaches are used for different groups when required and this is reflected in evaluation, processes findings, conclusions and recommendations. This leads to a rating of 'exceeds requirements' in the UN System-Wide Action Plan exercise. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

### Evaluation Norm 9 – National Evaluation Capacities

National Evaluation Capacity Development		
Organizational Mandate for NECD?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Has the function formally articulated that it will engage in NECD?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
If 'No', has the function formally articulated why it will NOT engage in NECD	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
NECD mandate expressed in the evaluation policy?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

National Evaluation Capacity Development		
Vision and integrated strategy and /or work plan for NECD?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Please select activity as appropriate		
<input type="checkbox"/> Engaging perspectives of nationals (including experts and institutions) in the conduct of evaluations		
<input type="checkbox"/> Including nationals in reference groups and advisory panels		
<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations led by national experts or institutions		
<input type="checkbox"/> Conduct of NECD training events		
Others (please specify) _____		

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback	
25. National Evaluation Capacity development (NECD)	1. There is no consideration of NECD in any formal documentation regarding the evaluation function.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Consideration of the function's position regarding NECD presented in evaluation documents but not mentioned in the evaluation policy. Some initiatives taken on an ad hoc basis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Adoption of NECD mandates and UNEG evaluation policy for NECD. Policy statement on NECD, but not integrated in	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	the work. Initiatives taken on a regular basis. OR A clear well-argued rationale for the evaluation function’s approach and level of engagement in NECD is articulated in formal documentation (can take the form of an articulation of why NECD is not being operationalized)			
	4. Full adoption of NECD mandates. Policy statement, strategy and workplan for NECD. Initiatives are an integral part of the work. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

### Evaluation Norm 10 – Professionalization

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
26. Staff competencies	1. Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations do not have core evaluation competencies, have little professional and managerial experience and have limited understanding of organizational and institutional issues. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations have relevant technical evaluation expertise as per the UNEG competency framework but have limited professional and managerial experience, and complementary knowledge <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	including limited understanding of organizational and institutional issues.			
	3. Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations have sound technical expertise, as per the UNEG competency framework, solid professional experience, and range of other complementary knowledge and skills (including managerial skills if managing consultants, etc.). They have a good understanding of organizational and institutional issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
	4. Staff responsible for designing, conducting and managing evaluations have extensive technical competencies, solid professional experience, and strong complementary knowledge and skills (including strong managerial skills if managing consultants, etc.). They apply innovative knowledge and skills to advance evaluation methodology. They have an excellent understanding of organizational and institutional issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8
27. Consultant competencies	1. There are no mechanisms in place to ensure that professional / technical standards are met by all consultants.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
	2. External consultants hired meet the defined levels of content and professional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>expertise required. Evaluation experts partially meet the UNEG evaluation competency standards (Standard 3.1- 3.2). Mechanisms to ensure that professional/ technical standards are met by all consultants.</p>			
	<p>3. External consultants hired meet/surpass the defined levels of content and professional expertise required. Evaluation experts meet the UNEG evaluation competency standards (Standard 3.1-3.2). There are mechanisms to ensure that professional/ technical standards are met by all consultants, but these are not always effective.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	<p>4. External consultants hired meet/surpass the defined levels of content and professional expertise required. Have solid professional experience. Thematic experts are familiar with evaluation principles and methodologies. Effective mechanisms are in place to ensure that professional/ technical standards are met by all consultants.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
<p>28. Role of evaluators and managers of evaluations</p>	<p>1. None There are numerous examples whereby evaluators and evaluation managers have not abided by accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics,</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	integrity and cultural sensitivity. The examples are recurrent.			
	2. Low There are a few examples whereby evaluators and evaluation managers have not abided by accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics, integrity and cultural sensitivity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Moderate Evaluators and evaluation managers usually abide by accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics, integrity and cultural sensitivity. There are infrequent exceptions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. High Evaluators and evaluation managers fully abide by all accepted norms, standards and guidelines of professionalism, ethics, integrity and cultural sensitivity. Their performance / behaviour is exemplary. There are no known cases whereby these norms and standards have been breached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
29. Professional development of staff	1. There are no opportunities for staff to enhance their evaluation skills and be trained on the latest evaluation methods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	2. There are ad hoc opportunities for some staff to enhance their evaluation skills and be trained on the latest evaluation methods. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There are clear policies, and opportunities for all staff to enhance their evaluation skills and be trained on the latest evaluation methods. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. There are clear policies and all staff engage in multiple opportunities for learning and sharing (including training, publications, presentations in conferences and sharing of knowledge and skills by delivering training). <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
30. Participation in UNEG	1. Not a member. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Member of UNEG but not active in task forces. Use of UNEG products. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Member of UNEG and active in task forces. Use of UNEG products. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Member of UNEG and active in driving the work of UNEG. Active use and promotion of UNEG products. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
31. Evaluators and managers of evaluation	1. Evaluation managers and evaluators are not formally required to reduce bias in evaluations. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	2. Evaluation managers and evaluators are formally required to reduce bias and errors in the design and conduct evaluation but there are no instructions / guidelines on how to do so. <input data-bbox="1136 375 1171 402" type="checkbox"/>	<input data-bbox="1224 375 1260 402" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input data-bbox="1318 375 1354 402" type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Evaluation managers and evaluators are formally required to reduce bias and errors in the design and conduct evaluation using professional/technical standards. There are instructions / guidelines on how to do so. <input data-bbox="1136 581 1171 609" type="checkbox"/>	<input data-bbox="1224 581 1260 609" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input data-bbox="1318 581 1354 609" type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Evaluation managers and evaluators are formally required to reduce bias and errors in the design and conduct evaluation using professional/technical standards. There are instructions/guidelines on how to do so and these are applied consistently across the unit. <input data-bbox="1136 824 1171 852" type="checkbox"/>	<input data-bbox="1224 824 1260 852" type="checkbox"/> 7	<input data-bbox="1318 824 1354 852" type="checkbox"/> 8	

## Part B - Institutional Norms

### Evaluation Norm 11 - Enabling environment

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
32. Evaluation architecture	1. Evaluation is not formally undertaken. Architecture is non-existent or not defined. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Architecture for evaluation is partially articulated. Linkages to decentralized evaluation arrangements (where they exist) other oversight, monitoring and/or performance reporting functions are made to some extent but are not fully operational. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Architecture for evaluation is well articulated. Linkages to decentralized evaluation arrangements (where they exist), other oversight, monitoring and/or performance reporting functions are made and are operational but not fully embedded / integrated in systems and Standard Operating Procedures. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Architecture for evaluation is well articulated. Linkages to decentralized evaluation arrangements (where they exist), other oversight, monitoring and/or performance reporting functions are fully operational, embedded and effective. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
33. Governance structure * Legislative * Management * Evaluation	1. The governance structure for evaluation is not defined.  Governing bodies are not active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas never feature evaluation topics or issues.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The governance structure for evaluation is defined. In practice the roles and responsibilities of legislative/ governing bodies and senior management are unclear. There are no guidelines or operational directives.  Governing bodies are occasionally active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas occasionally feature evaluation topics or issues.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. The roles and responsibilities of legislative/ governing bodies and senior management are clearly defined. There are guidelines/ operational directives.  Governing bodies are quite active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas regularly feature evaluation topics or issues.	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. The governance structure for evaluation is effective. The roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. Legislative/ governing	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>bodies and senior management play a key role in strengthening and promoting an evaluation culture. Governing bodies are very active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas always feature evaluation topics or issues. There are different and specific structures in place regularly looking at evaluation.</p> <p>e.g. a dedicated committee on oversight / evaluation issues</p>			
<p>34. Support to decentralized/ self/Management-led evaluations functions by the central evaluation unit</p>	<p>1. There is no support to decentralized or technical evaluation functions by the central evaluation unit. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	<p>2. Support to decentralized or technical evaluation functions by the central evaluation unit is recognized as important but is limited. There is no well-defined strategy of how the central unit can support or enhance the quality of decentralized evaluation, nor clear guidelines for the decentralized evaluation function. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	<p>3. Support to decentralized or technical evaluation functions by the central evaluation unit is good. There is a clear understanding of decentralized evaluation and its role in the evaluation architecture. Guidelines or manuals for decentralized <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>evaluations have been produced and disseminated. Linkages and alignments are being established between the central and decentralized functions.</p>			
	<p>4. Extensive support to decentralized or technical evaluation functions by the central evaluation unit. There are guidelines/ manuals and/or strategy/ for decentralized or technical evaluations. The central and decentralized/technical evaluation functions are well-defined and linked/aligned.</p> <p>The governance structure for evaluation is effective. The roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. Legislative/ governing bodies and senior management play a key role in strengthening and promoting an evaluation culture. Governing bodies are very active in their role with respect to evaluation. Formal Governing Body meeting agendas always feature evaluation topics or issues. There are different and specific structures in place regularly looking at evaluation.</p> <p>e.g. a dedicated committee on oversight / evaluation issues</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
35. System wide harmonization, collaboration, coherence and efficiency	1. There is no coordination or collaboration with other UN organizations in the conduct of evaluations. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. There is coordination (not collaboration) that is limited to sharing of information. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Active coordination and some collaboration. Evaluation plans and activities are systematically shared with other UN organizations. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Active in UN reform and harmonization. Excellent coordination and collaboration. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

### Evaluation Norm 12 – Evaluation Policy

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
36. Evaluation Policy (see attributes below) with mandates from governing/legislative bodies	1. There is no clear mandate for evaluation and there is no Evaluation Policy/ little or no codification of practices. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. There is a mandate for evaluation. Evaluation Policy which recognizes the adoption of the UNEG Norms & Standards exist, but it does not sufficiently cover the UNEG criteria a – c for an Evaluation Policy. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There is a clear mandate for evaluation and the Evaluation Policy articulates what it covers and its purpose. However, it does <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>not link evaluation to the rest of the organization (approval and follow up mechanisms).</p> <p>Moreover, the Evaluation Policy covers UNEG criteria a to c and most of d to i and it describes how the organization will adapt UNEG norms and standards to fit the organization.</p>			
	<p>4. The mandate for evaluation is strong. The Evaluation Policy clearly describes Governance structure all UNEG good practices (a – i) as well as other good practices (j-t) are covered <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Moreover, the policy describes in great detail the adaptation of UNEG norms and standards and inclusion of other norms to fit the context of the organization.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
37. Strategy for evaluation and support from senior management for evaluation	<p>1. There is no organizational strategy for evaluation.</p> <p>Senior management leadership and support for the evaluation function is missing; there is no evaluation culture nor understanding of the added value of evaluation <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	<p>2. There is an organizational strategy for evaluation which operationalizes the evaluation policy. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>There is a results framework (with some indicators, of variable quality) for</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>evaluation. There is some understanding on the part of senior management of the added value of evaluation. There are a few 'champions' who promote the function.</p>			
	<p>3. There is an organizational strategy for evaluation which operationalizes the evaluation policy. It specifies the role of evaluation and what will make the evaluation function effective/efficient, have impact and be sustainable. There is a results framework (with a full set of indicators of variable quality) for evaluation.</p> <p>Most senior managers understand the role and added value of evaluation, and there are several 'champions' who promote the function.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	<p>4. There is an organizational strategy for evaluation which operationalizes the evaluation policy. It clearly specifies the role of evaluation and what will make the evaluation function effective/efficient, have impact and be sustainable. There is articulated theory of change for the organization, supported by a results framework (with a comprehensive set of SMART indicators) for evaluation.</p> <p>Senior management fully understands the role and added value of evaluation, and</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	actively support and promote the function within the organization.			
38. Supporting guidelines and/or structures	1. There are no guidelines / documents or structures in place for implementation. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. There are some guidelines / documents and structures in place for implementation. However, they do not refer to key aspects of the policy (i.e., UNEG attributes for an evaluation policy [a – d] in criterion 31). <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There are many guidelines / documents and structures in place for implementation. They refer to selective aspects of the policy [> 4 attributes including a-d] <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. There are documents and structures in place for implementation. They are comprehensive and cover all aspects of good practice for the policy. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
39. Monitoring of policy implementation and revision of the policy	1. There is no policy. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. A policy exists but its implementation is not monitored. There is no plan to review or update the policy and have it formally approved. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There is ad hoc monitoring of policy implementation (e.g. the monitoring of performance indicators and some level of reporting to senior management or <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	governing bodies). The policy is updated on this basis and formally approved.			
	4. There is on-going monitoring of policy implementation. Adjustments are made regularly (policy revised at least every 5 years) on the basis of: An assessment of implementation, evolving norms and standards, organizational changes, new demands and views of stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
40. Continuous assessment of the fulfilment of the policy/ norms and standards	1. No initiatives taken for a continuous assessment of the fulfilment of the policy/ norms and standards [independence, credibility, utility] <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Few, ad hoc initiatives undertaken. Adaptation and change process is slow. Focused on mechanical implementation issues rather than broad, strategic ones. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Several initiatives undertaken periodically as part of annual work plan. Adaptation and change is on-going. Occasional review and / or improvement of evaluation guidelines and manuals <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Initiatives undertaken on a regular basis. Adaptation and change is an integral part of the work of the unit. Frequent and regular review and / or improvement of evaluation guidelines and manuals <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

### Evaluation Norm 13 - Responsibility for the evaluation function

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
41. Appointment of Head of Evaluation (Head of Oversight if applicable)	1. There is no central evaluation unit. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Appointment made by the Head of the organization without consideration of UNEG evaluation competencies. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Appointment made by the Head of the organization with consideration of UNEG evaluation competencies. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Appointment made by the Governing/Legislative Board with consideration of UNEG evaluation competencies. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
42. Core resources	1. There are no core resources to support staff dedicated to evaluation. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The human resources available for evaluation are shared with monitoring and/or other oversight activities. Support for staff positions is uncertain, unstable and / or unsustainable. Transaction costs incurred in mobilizing resources. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There are clear dedicated staff resources for evaluation, but funding to support staff positions can be unstable and/or unsustainable. Transaction costs sometimes incurred in mobilizing resources. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>4. There are clear/separate dedicated staff resources for evaluation. Source of support stable and sustainable.</p> <p>The core resources are commensurate with requirements for comprehensive evaluation coverage of the organization. Supports a function which is proactive and focused on refining itself.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
43. Non-core/ extra budgetary financial resources	<p>1. The evaluation function is highly dependent on non- core/extra budgetary resources, and there are no measures in place to (a) safeguard independence, and (b) ensure sustainability of the function.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	<p>2. The evaluation function is highly dependent on non- core/extra budgetary resources, and there are few measures in place to (a) safeguard independence, and (b) ensure sustainability of the function (ensure use aligned with organizational mandate or needs of unit).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	<p>3. The evaluation function is not solely dependent on non- core resources, and there are adequate measures in place to (a) safeguard independence, and (b) ensure financial sustainability of the function.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	<p>4. The evaluation function benefits from adequate non-core resources for its</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>operations. There are strong measures in place to (a) safeguard independence, and (b) ensure sustainability of the function. Non-core resources are managed at the discretion of the unit Head. The unit effectively mobilizes and uses non-core resources to strengthen its programme of work.</p>			
44. RBM framework	<p>1. The organization does not have an operational RBM policy or system. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The overall organizational culture for results and accountability / learning is poor. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	<p>2. An RBM policy / system exists and is operational. Linkages (among evaluation, strategy, budget, programmatic areas, etc.) are not well defined. Implementation of RBM is not complete (results-based reporting not comprehensive). <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>The organizational culture for results and accountability / learning depends on individuals. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	<p>3. The RBM policy/system exists and its implementation/ coverage is more or less complete. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>It provides some key elements to support the conduct of evaluation (logical framework, results, performance indicators, reporting and data systems are of high <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	<p>quality). But evaluation is not fully integrated into the system (the linkages are not well/fully developed).</p> <p>The organizational culture for results and accountability / learning is only partially reflected in the organization’s practices. There are occasional capacity building initiatives for enhancing the organizational culture.</p>			
	<p>4. The RBM policy/system exists and its implementation / coverage is comprehensive. It provides all key elements to support the conduct of evaluation (logical framework, results, performance indicators, reporting and data systems are of high quality). Evaluation is fully integrated into the system (the linkages are well/fully developed) and its role (advisory or other) defined.</p> <p>The organizational culture for results and accountability / learning is fully reflected in the organization’s practices. There are systematic capacity building initiatives for enhancing the organizational culture.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
45. Planning for coverage (see criteria below)	1. Evaluations are not planned and prioritized according to clear selection criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	2. Evaluations are planned but the selection criteria are unclear and/or not systematically applied. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Evaluations are planned and prioritized according to clear selection criteria. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Evaluations are planned and prioritized according to clear and strategic selection criteria. They allow for flexibility and maximum coverage. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
46. Actual coverage and responsiveness of the plan	1. Coverage is ad hoc. Few areas are covered on a selective basis. The plan is inflexible to respond to changing conditions and demands. Coverage is weak and selective. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. The plan is somewhat flexible, but mostly focuses on own internal capacity and limited resources. Not sure how supportive of decision-making it is. >50% of substantive* areas are covered within a 5-year period but on a selective basis. (* themes or topics deemed as key priorities within the organization's approved programme of work.) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Coverage is adequate and the plan is adaptable. Supports demand and decision making at various levels of the organization. It recognizes the need for balancing various <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	activities. >75% of substantive areas are covered within a 5- year period.			
	4. Coverage is good/excellent. The plan is flexible to changing conditions and demands and is supported by a strategy for doing so. Clearly linked to demands and decision-making at various levels of the organization. 100% of substantive areas are covered within a 5-year period. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
47. Technical and managerial evaluation guidelines and tools	1. There are no evaluation guidelines or tools available. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. There are few evaluation guidelines and tools. They are not comprehensive. They are not applied consistently across the organization. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. There are evaluation guidelines and tools, covering key areas. They are applied somewhat consistently across the organization. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. There is a comprehensive set of evaluation guidelines and tools. These are applied consistently across the organization. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	

**The following planning/selection criteria are used (check as applicable):**

Please select activity as appropriate

Organization strategic plan / priorities

Internal and  external stakeholder demand

Emerging / global trends

Internal and external coherence

Evaluability assessment

Funding amount

Up-scaling value

Others (please specify)

**Evaluation Norm 14 - Evaluation use and follow-up**

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
48.Recommendation tracking system	1. There is no follow- up mechanism. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Follow-up mechanisms in place and there is ad hoc follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Follow-up mechanisms in place and well designed. There is systematic follow-up on <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating		Comments/ Feedback
	the implementation of the recommendations.			
	4. Follow-up mechanism is well designed and of high quality. There is systematic follow-up of the recommendations. Reporting on implementation status is mandated. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
49.Recommendation implementation rates	1. There is no follow- up on the implementation of the recommendations. Not clear indication of recommendation accepted and implemented. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Less than 50% of the recommendations are implemented within the first three years. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Between 50-85% of the recommendations are implemented within the first three years. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. More than 85% of the recommendations are implemented within the first three years. The evaluation function assesses the implementation of recommendations and the results achieved as a result of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	
HIGH LEVEL 50. Corporate/ summative use (Use for strategic	1. Not used <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Low use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
direction setting at organizational level)	3. Moderate use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. High use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
MID LEVEL 51. Corporate/ summative use (Use for strategic direction setting at higher programmatic level: tied to performance)	1. Not used <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Low use A few evaluations have been used as input for the development or revision of the organization's programme of work or thematic strategies. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Moderate use Some evaluations have been used as input for the development or revision of the organization's programme of work or thematic strategies. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. High use All evaluations are used as input for the development or revision of the organization's programme of work or thematic strategies. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	
IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL 52. Formative use for on-going adjustments at project and programme level for programmatic improvement and learning – what is	1. Not used <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Low use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Average use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. High use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Assessment Factor	Level	Rating	Comments/ Feedback
working, what changes to make, etc. (during interventions)			
53. Use external to organization	1. Evaluations are never cited outside the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	
	2. Evaluations are rarely cited outside the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	
	3. Evaluations are occasionally cited outside the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	
	4. Evaluations are often cited outside the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	

Nature of use for central evaluation reports (check as applicable):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	High level – For developing corporate strategies and policies for strategic decision making in the organization by the governing/legislative bodies and senior management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mid-level – For management and broader programmatic decisions by senior and mid-level management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation level – For on-going adjustments at project and programme level by project and programme managers