



# The Role of Evaluation in Results-Based Management

This report, prepared by the UNEG Task Force on Results-Based Management, highlights seven key issues that emerged from a survey to ascertain the role evaluation plays in the implementation of Results-Based Management in various international organizations.

## Introduction

1. Many organizations of the United Nations system have embarked on a process of introducing performance management systems referred to as Results-Based Management (RBM). RBM has been defined as a broad management strategy aimed at achieving improved performance and demonstrable results. A chief impetus driving the adoption of RBM strategies has been the need to be able to present results that are backed by measurable indicators and evidence of achievement. This has served as an entry-point for a re-invigorated interest in the use of evaluative techniques such as surveys, questionnaires, focus groups and content analysis. Underpinning the entire RBM effort has been a renaissance in the use of the logical-framework as an instrument for capturing the *raison d'être* of a project or activity.

2. RBM and performance assessment have given a fresh lease of life to the function of evaluation in many of the organizations of the UN system. At the very least, RBM has meant that programme managers are being asked to use evaluation techniques in their quest for credible, data and evidence-based assertions of development and programme results. This has provided evaluation offices with a new opportunity to promote the merits of evaluation as providing objective judgments on the relevance, appropriateness, efficiency and impact of programme activities. One of the advantages of the RBM approach is that it can be used in a variety of programme contexts – whether it is to frame and measure the effectiveness of a development intervention or the efficiency of a process-based management activity.

3. RBM in the UN should however also be seen in the context of the managing for development results (MfDR) initiative, to which the multilateral development banks, bilateral donors, UNDG, a number of civil society organizations and partner countries<sup>1</sup> have committed themselves through the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness 2005, where development effectiveness (results), partnership, harmonization, ownership, alignment and mutual accountability are the main focus.

## UNEG Task Force on Evaluation and RBM

4. The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) decided at its Annual Meeting in April 2005 in Rome, to create a Task Force (TF) on Evaluation and RBM.

5. The main purpose of the TF was to generate a body of knowledge for UNEG concerning the present role of evaluation in RBM, in order to identify best practice model(s) and future challenges<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Managing for Development Results (MfDR) is a management strategy focused on development performance and sustainable improvements in country outcomes. It provides a coherent framework for development effectiveness in which performance information is used for improved decision making, and it includes practical tools for strategic planning, risk management, progress monitoring, and outcome evaluation. (*Definition based on agreement at the 2004 Marrakech Roundtable on Results 2004*).

<sup>2</sup> The Terms of Reference of the Task Force is included in Annex 1 to this report.

6. In early 2006, the Task Force undertook preparations for a survey to ascertain the role evaluation plays in RBM in various international organizations. To that end, a web-based questionnaire was developed with active participation of all Task Force members. The web-based survey went live on March 2, 2006.

7. The preliminary results of the survey were presented and discussed at the UNEG Annual Meeting in Paris, March 2006, as “work in progress”.

## **UNEG survey on the role of evaluation in RBM in the UN Organizations**

8. The questionnaire<sup>3</sup> was sent to a total of 26 UN entities, including specialized agencies, the UN Secretariat and funds and programmes. By March 31, 2006, a total of 21 out of 26 UN organizations surveyed had responded to the questionnaire.

9. Although the response rate to the survey was satisfactory, the survey did not allow to capture different points of view from within the same organization as originally envisaged. This is because, in most cases, organizations opted for a corporate response, filling in the questionnaire centrally. In most such cases, the unit responsible for evaluation was the entity charged with filling in the questionnaire.

10. Individual text responses are not included in the report due to confidentiality reasons. However, the main issues indicated by individual organizations are included in the analysis.

11. This report contains the findings emanating from the survey and their analysis. It provides an overview of the status of implementation of RBM in UN organizations, ongoing coordination and collaboration, and the role of evaluation in RBM. Some issues have been identified which could form the basis for further analysis and/or discussion, in particular when it comes to defining the role of evaluation in RBM.

---

<sup>3</sup> A copy of the questionnaire can be found in the Annex.

## Survey results

### Results-Based Management (RBM) in surveyed UN organizations

#### *Introduction of RBM*

##### *Findings*

12. The majority of respondents indicated that RBM has been adopted as the broad management strategy within their organization during the late 90ies-early years of 2000, at all levels, including headquarters and field offices. Some organizations have only introduced RBM partially, in connection with some selected activities, in particular of a technical / development nature.

13. Although the majority of organizations have introduced RBM, only about a third have established comprehensive corporate RBM frameworks which covers all aspects of RBM and includes a description of roles and responsibilities. Also, where such a framework does exist for the organization as a whole, it is not as strategic as it could be, but rather tends to emphasize reporting requirements. Among those organizations with a partially written conceptual framework, many indicated the existence of a variety of manuals, guidelines, instructions etc, but the lack of a “holistic” approach. In addition, most of such guidance is mostly process orientated.

14. Most organizations considered the introduction of RBM as being a continuous ongoing process, including further refinement of RBM tools, further strengthening of the results culture and the capacity of managers and staff to apply RBM concepts and use performance information, and development of electronic platforms/systems to support RBM.

##### *Discussion*

15. Although most UN Organization have adopted RBM as their main management strategy, existing RBM guidance needs to be consolidated within most organizations into a comprehensive framework with a more strategic managing-for-results focus, rather than an emphasis on processes.

#### ***RBM models***

##### *Findings*

16. The RBM models in the surveyed organizations all include the “classical” elements of RBM: formulating objectives and results, developing indicators, monitoring and collecting performance data, using performance information and reporting vis-à-vis planned results.

17. Some organizations indicated that although their RBM system, in principle, included a number of the above elements, some of those elements in practice were still pending effective implementation. The development of indicators, monitoring for results and use of performance information was, in particular, mentioned to be the weakest components of RBM. Specifically, organizations reported that performance information emanating from evaluations, conducted at all levels, is only partially used in internal

decision-making processes, including for future programming, and that evaluations, in the majority of cases, are only partially, or not at all, presented to the Governing Bodies before any planning / programming decision are taken by them.

18. In addition, 50% of the respondents indicated that RBM had only partially, or not at all, helped produce results which are more credible or useful. This was explained by the facts that RBM is mainly perceived as a reporting rather than a management tool, corporate results frameworks are too high level for program managers to relate to, gap between country level results and corporate results, and lack of “results-culture” among program managers.

### *Discussion*

19. Most organizations have, at least theoretically, embraced RBM systems which are composed of the “classical” RBM elements. In practice, however, there is still a gap between the theoretical design of RBM systems and the effective implementation of their various components.

20. The use of performance information for learning, accountability and decision-making purposes, i.e. closing the performance management “loop”, is among the weaker elements in RBM. This is partly because RBM in many cases has not developed into a management tool but is rather perceived by management and program managers as a technical reporting exercise which do not merit a lot of attention for the most part of the year. This suggests that “managing-for-results” is still a considerable challenge within the UN system, although some progress has been made since the introduction of RBM, with the further development/alignment of corporate and country level results and a further strengthening of the organizational results culture being the main challenges.

#### **Issues**

The change to a managing-for-results culture in UN organizations continues to be a main challenge. Should UNEG play a role in identifying good practices in promoting a managing-for-results culture.

### ***Results in terms of outputs or outcomes***

#### *Findings*

21. The majority of organizations define their results in terms of a combination of outputs, outcomes and impacts. However, from the responses it is not possible to discern which of these types of results are emphasized.

#### *Discussion*

22. The findings suggest that organizations are both focusing on results for management purposes (efficiency concerns) and on development results (effectiveness concerns).

23. One of the biggest challenges when defining results is the consideration whether results should be defined as a basis for management with an emphasis on efficiency concerns (i.e. at a level at which the Organization has more control) or as outcomes/impacts with an emphasis on effectiveness concerns at the national/regional/global level (i.e. more meaningful but less useful for management purposes).

24. John Mayne in his paper “Challenges and Lessons in Results-Based Management” (2005), argues that the more the focus is on outcomes the less chance there is of distorting behaviours, i.e. managers and staff focus on a selection of a few specific indicators (at a lower level) eventually to the detriment of what the programme is actually trying to achieve. By focusing on outcomes, measures will be closely related to the true aim of the activities. He also argues that it is even preferable to focus on whether the whole result chain is happening, rather than only the end result itself.

25. The managing for development results (MfDR) initiative which equally pushes in the direction of focusing on development effectiveness, implies defining organizational results as outcomes/impacts at the national/regional/global level.

#### **Issues**

Should UNEG play a role in advocating for an increasingly outcome-based corporate results structure within UN organizations?

### ***Electronic systems to support RBM***

#### ***Findings***

26. In most organizations, RBM is either supported fully or partially by electronic tools (in most cases only partially). The various systems supporting RBM processes within an organization are however not necessarily integrated to form a comprehensive RBM supporting platform. In addition, some organizations indicated that the use of the systems by senior managers and staff was low.

#### ***Discussion***

27. Although most organizations have electronic tools to support RBM, they are often stand-alone applications and are not widely used by managers and staff.

### ***RBM harmonization initiatives***

#### ***Findings***

28. About half of the respondents reported that they are taking part in RBM harmonization initiatives with other organizations, mostly within the framework of the UN Development Group (UNDG) Harmonization and Simplification Initiative which mainly concerns programme modalities at the country level. Some UN system harmonization is also taking place through the CEB. Non-UNDG members were less likely to take part in RBM harmonization initiatives.

## *Discussion*

29. The responses seem to indicate that harmonization among organizations mostly takes place at the country level, but that less harmonization efforts are ongoing regarding corporate RBM systems. This points towards: a) a multi-layer RBM system/structure in some organizations, with a distinction between RBM in the field and RBM at headquarters; and b) that most UN Organizations are developing their own RBM model.

### **Issues**

- Should corporate RBM systems increasingly be harmonized throughout the UN system? And should UNEG promote and play a role in such a harmonization?
- Should UNEG play a role in the harmonization of RBM at the country level, bearing in mind that RBM at that level is not necessarily an integral part of the overall organizational RBM framework?

## ***The Role of Evaluation in RBM***

### *Findings*

30. There was general agreement among respondents that evaluation has received a new lease of life with the introduction of RBM, and that, in particular, RBM has strengthened the role of evaluation, facilitated the promotion of an evaluation culture, enhanced the use of evaluation findings in programming and put greater emphasis on self-evaluations by program managers.

31. However, opinions were mixed as to whether evaluation should be considered part of RBM. The integration of evaluations to provide complementary performance information is considered explicit elements of the RBM conceptual framework in half of the organizations surveyed whereas in the other half, evaluation is considered a complementary function. Some organizations strongly expressed the view that evaluation is an independent function and should not be considered part of RBM systems due to conflict of interest.

32. The survey also suggests that the role of evaluation is in direct correlation with the size of the organization and its evaluation function: the bigger the organization and its central evaluation function (in terms of staff and non-staff resources), the more the role of evaluation is perceived as an “complementary function to RBM” using independence arguments. On the other hand, the smaller the agency and the central evaluation function, the more evaluation is seen as part of RBM with the central evaluation office performing / or closely linked to RBM related processes, in particular providing input into the definition of results frameworks and preparing program performance reports.

33. The survey findings suggest that the majority of central evaluation units fulfills the Norms and Standards independence criteria and reports directly to the Head of Organization and/or Governing bodies (irrespective of whether evaluation is part of internal oversight office or not), so its placement,

*i.e.* organizational independence, does not determine to what extent it becomes involved in RBM (its size seems to be a more preponderant factor).

34. Also, the organizational placement of the central evaluation office does not seem to have been directly affected by the introduction of RBM. Although it appears that the organizational placement of evaluation functions have changed since the introduction of RBM, respondents indicated that it was not because of the introduction of RBM, but more due to a need to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation function.

35. Regarding roles and responsibilities, in the organizations surveyed, the “classical” evaluation tasks, such as conducting “internal” and managing “external” independent evaluations, preparing evaluation policies, guidelines, and methodologies, compiling and disseminating lessons learned from evaluations, tracking the follow-up to evaluations, developing of evaluation plans and conducting evaluation capacity building activities, are primarily confined to central and decentralized evaluation functions.

36. In addition, in most organizations, the central and decentralized evaluation function is responsible for coordinating self-evaluations by Program Managers, quality assurance of self-evaluations, and providing advice and support to program managers for conducting self-evaluations. However, about a third of the surveyed organizations indicated that the responsibility for these three latter tasks lied with the planning and programming functions.

37. The responsibility for RBM related tasks such as: validating performance data, quality assurance of results frameworks, providing advice and support to program managers for preparing performance assessment reports, providing RBM technical support to program managers, participation in preparation of RBM planning frameworks (strategic frameworks, program and budgets, *etc*), providing RBM quality assurance and conducting RBM capacity building activities, lies with the planning and programming and/or budget functions in the slight majority of cases. However, the central and decentralized evaluation functions perform, or are involved in, those tasks in about 30-40% of all organizations surveyed.

38. The level of coordination among the various functions appears to be greatest between the evaluation function and the performance assessment and monitoring function, due to the fact that in many cases the evaluation function is responsible for preparing and or coordinating the programme performance reports (which is perceived in many instances as a monitoring exercise). Coordination seems to be much less frequent when it comes to planning and programming and very rare when it comes to budgeting.

39. In most cases, the evaluation function was involved in the introduction of RBM, in some cases even taking the lead, designing the initial conceptual frameworks, developing results-based reporting systems, performing quality control of results frameworks, preparing guidelines and developing and conducting RBM training. The function continues to be a strong advocator for improved RBM, and is, in many cases, still involved in on-going processes to strengthen RBM. However, the continued involvement in shaping RBM is in most cases limited to internal consultations and processes, thus, the evaluation function is not involved in discussions with Member States / Governing Bodies on this subject matter.

40. The main responsibility for institutionalizing RBM has in most organizations been handed over to operational units, and now lies mainly with offices responsible for strategic planning or programme and

budget. However, some evaluation functions continue to be the main responsible for the institutionalization of RBM and continue to be directly involved in various RBM processes, in particular the designing of RBM results frameworks and the preparation of programme performance reports.

## *Discussion*

41. When considering the various RBM models in the surveyed organizations, the differences in approaches are most pronounced when it comes to the role of evaluation. The survey suggests that although evaluation is seen as part of the RBM system in the vast majority of the surveyed organizations, it is considered outside RBM by a significant number of respondents<sup>4</sup>.

42. The distinction between “being an integral part of” and “being a complementary function” is not clear-cut. Within the same organization, at a higher corporate level, evaluation can be “a complementary independent function” used to assess systems and processes at the corporate level, whereas at the programme level, evaluation is an integral part of RBM providing information on results and input to better performance management.

43. In several organizations, the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation function, in addition to the strictly speaking evaluation related tasks, also encompass performance assessment and other RBM related tasks, in particular in smaller agencies.

44. The evaluation function’s involvement in RBM seems not to be related to its actual organizational placement (i.e. organizational independence).

45. When considering that only 33% of organizations responded affirmatively to the question of whether roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in a written conceptual framework, it appears that the evaluation function is involved in performing RBM related tasks, but that its role has not been formally defined.

46. Most organizations would most likely agree that conflict-of-interest issues exist when evaluation becomes involved in RBM and that evaluation, although eventually involved in the introduction of RBM, should not be involved in the long-term. However, the reality appears to be that many small central evaluation functions can simply not “afford” not being involved as they would “miss the train” and risk becoming sidelined (squeezed out) by performance measurement.

47. Having organizational results determined in terms of outputs or outcomes also affects the debate on the role of evaluation in RBM. The more organizations move towards outcomes, the more important the complementarity of evaluation becomes in providing performance information (performance measurement being the other source of performance information) in particular when it comes to attribution issues and comprehensive information about the whole performance chain / story. This would imply that evaluation could increasingly be considered to be an “integral part” of RBM.

---

<sup>4</sup> 35%.

### Issues

- Should evaluation (independent) be considered part of RBM or would it compromise the independence of evaluation (conflict of interest)?
- Should UNEG come up with a position paper on the role of evaluations in RBM systems. This position paper could articulate basic principles and include instructive best practices.

## ***Evaluations' role in assessing progress made in the implementation of RBM***

### *Findings*

48. The assessment of the institutionalization of RBM has been part of independent external evaluations / reviews and/or external audits carried out of some UN organizations (including by the JIU). In some other cases, external reviews have focused on some aspects of RBM, but have not been comprehensive.

49. Only a few organizations have conducted internal reviews in which the central evaluation function has played the lead role in assessing progress in the implementation of RBM.

### *Discussion*

50. Evaluation is being used as a tool for validating RBM systems in the context of externally driven evaluation/review exercises. However, the internal central evaluation function is, in general, not used as a RBM oversight or quality assurance tool at the “macro” corporate level.

### Issues

- Should UNEG attempt to draw UN system-wide lessons learned from evaluations/ reviews carried out, in particular with regard to the role of evaluation in RBM?
- Should UNEG play a role in promoting the role of the central evaluation function in assessing progress/ validating/ providing quality assurance of RBM initiatives at the “macro” corporate level (conflict of interest issues if evaluation is considered part of RBM).

## Annex – Survey questionnaire: The role of evaluation in results-based management

This questionnaire has been developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) Task Force on RBM and Evaluation, as part of a survey to ascertain the role evaluation plays in RBM within the UN system and other Organizations. To adequately capture the points of view of the planning, programming, budget, monitoring and evaluation functions, the questionnaire will be sent to several units/offices within the same Organization.

The survey is part of a comprehensive study carried out by the UNEG Task Force on RBM and Evaluation, which aims at identifying RBM and evaluation best practice models and future challenges for the role of evaluation in RBM.

### Definition of Results-Based Management (RBM)

RBM is defined as “a management approach aimed at changing the way organizations operate, with improving performance (achieving results) as the central orientation”<sup>1</sup>.

#### 1. General information about your organization

1.1 Name of Organization \_\_\_\_\_

1.2 Number of staff: At headquarters \_\_\_\_\_ In field offices \_\_\_\_\_

1.3 Regular core budget \_\_\_\_\_

1.4 Number of field offices: Regional offices \_\_\_\_\_ Country offices \_\_\_\_\_

1.5 Please indicate in which part of the Organization you are working:

- Planning
- Programming
- Budget
- Monitoring
- Evaluation

---

<sup>1</sup> JIU/REP/2004/6.

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Results-Based Management (RBM)** 2.1. Has RBM been introduced in your Organization?

Yes  No  Partially

If yes: When was RBM introduced? \_\_\_\_\_

What are the plans, if any, for the further strengthening of RBM in your Organization?  
\_\_\_\_\_

If no: Does your Organization have any plans to introduce RBM in the future?

Yes  No

If affirmative, please give details as to what those plans are and when the process is expected to start?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

***If partially, please explain:***  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2.2 Please indicate at what levels of your Organization RBM has been, or will be, introduced?:

	RBM has been introduced	RBM will be introduced
At all levels; at Headquarters and in field offices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In all departments at Headquarters, including administrative departments, but not in field offices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In technical, but not administrative, departments at Headquarters, and not in field offices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify): _____		

2.3 Please indicate which organizational unit/office, if any, has/will have the main responsibility for the institutionalization of RBM  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2.4 Has any independent comprehensive evaluation, peer review or audit of the institutionalization of RBM been undertaken, or are there any plans to undertake one (please provide details)?

---

---

If an evaluation, peer review or audit was undertaken, what were the consequences of the findings of the evaluation(s) or audit(s):

---

---

2.5 Has your Organization participated in, or does your Organization plan to participate in, any RBM harmonization initiatives with other Organizations?

Yes    No    Partially

Please provide details:

---

---

2.6 Please indicate the involvement of the evaluation function in the introduction of RBM in your Organization (check as many as apply):

	Yes	No
The evaluation function was involved in the introduction of RBM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The evaluation function is involved in on-going initiatives to strengthen RBM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The evaluation function will be involved in any future initiatives to further strengthen RBM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The evaluation function is expected to be involved when RBM will be introduced	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain in what ways the evaluation function was, is, or will be, involved:

---

---

2.7 Please indicate whether RBM in your Organization includes, or will include, the following (check as many as apply):

	RBM includes	RBM will include
Formulating objectives and results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Selecting indicators to measure progress towards each objective and result	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regularly collecting data on indicators and results to monitor performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reviewing, analyzing and reporting actual results vis-à-vis the targets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrating evaluations to provide complementary, in-depth performance information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Using performance information for accountability, learning and decision-making purposes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify) _____		

2.8 Please indicate whether results in your Organization are defined:

- In terms of outputs
- In terms of outcomes
- A combination of outputs and outcomes
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

2.9 Has the introduction of RBM, in your view, helped program managers produce results which are more credible/useful?

- Yes    No    Partially    N/A

Please explain:

---



---

2.10 What methods are used within your Organization to collect data on indicators and demonstrate results (check as many as apply)?

- Reviews of internal records
- Surveys
- Interviews
- Content analysis of reports
- Focus groups
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

2.11 Does a clear, written conceptual framework exist for RBM (procedures, manuals, organizational strategies and/or policies, guidelines)?

- Yes    No    Partially    N/A

Please explain:

---



---

If yes: Please indicate whether the conceptual framework clearly describes the following functions, including roles and responsibilities (check as many as apply):

	Yes	No
Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Budgeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Performance assessment <sup>2</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transfer of Lessons <sup>3</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

---

<sup>2</sup> Performance assessment refers to the assessment of organizational performance and is defined here as an assessment of the extent to which results have been achieved without due process of evaluation.

<sup>3</sup> Into subsequent planning.

2.12 In your Organization, is RBM supported by an electronic platform/database?

- Yes    No    Partially

If yes or partially, please explain and provide further details of this system:

---

---

2.13 Is your Organization's Annual Report presented in an RBM format/structure?

- Yes    No    Partially

If yes or partially, could you provide us with an example of the latest report, or information on how we could access a copy:

---

### **3. RBM and Evaluation**

3.1 What role does evaluation as function have in RBM in your organization?

- Evaluation is considered an integral part of RBM providing complementary, in-depth performance information.
- Evaluation is considered a complementary function, but not strictly speaking part of RBM.
- Other (please specify)

---

---

3.2. Please indicate in what ways the introduction of RBM, in your view, has impacted on the role of the evaluation function in your Organization (check as many as apply).

- There has been no impact on the role of evaluation
- The role of evaluation in general has been strengthened
- The role of evaluation in general has been weakened
- It has helped program managers use evaluation techniques more successfully
- It has facilitated the promotion of an evaluation culture
- Resources for evaluation has increased
- Resources for evaluation has decreased
- The use of independent evaluations has increased

- The use of independent evaluations has decreased
  - The use of evaluation findings in programming has been strengthened
  - The use of evaluation findings in decision-making has been strengthened
  - Greater emphasis on development effectiveness versus organizational performance
  - Greater emphasis on self-evaluations (also called auto evaluations) by program managers
  - Greater emphasis on real time evaluations
  - Other (please specify)
- 
- 

3.3 Please indicate below the existing linkages between the evaluation function and RBM in your Organization:

	Yes	No	Partially	N/A
Evaluation plans of the central evaluation unit/office are aligned with the program and budget cycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self-evaluations by program managers (at headquarters) are aligned with the program and budget cycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Decentralized evaluations (both independent and self-evaluations) conducted by field offices are aligned with the program and budget cycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource allocations for the effective implementation of evaluation plans of the central evaluation unit/office are a clearly visible part of program and budgets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource allocations for the conduct of decentralized evaluations by field offices are a clearly visible part of program and budgets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation findings and recommendations from evaluations conducted by the central evaluation unit/office are systematically used in internal decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation findings and recommendations from self-evaluations conducted by program managers are systematically used in internal decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation findings and recommendations from decentralized evaluations by field offices are systematically used in the internal decision-making process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation findings and recommendations from evaluations are systematically monitored to track progress in their implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation findings and recommendations are presented to / reviewed by relevant governing bodies before any planning / programming decisions are being taken by them	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation lessons learned are systematically applied in future programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The evaluation policy of the Organization is consistent with the overall RBM approach and strategies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation is used to validate RBM conceptual frameworks / assess progress in the implementation of RBM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation findings and recommendations are reviewed by the same Governing body committees which review performance assessment reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

3.4 Please indicate the level of coordination (by circling the appropriate rating) between the central evaluation unit/office and:

	Infrequent (once a year of less				Frequent (once a week)
	1	2	3	4	5
Planning	1	2	3	4	5
Programming	1	2	3	4	5
Budget	1	2	3	4	5
Monitoring	1	2	3	4	5
Performance assessment	1	2	3	4	5

3.5 Please indicate the organizational placement of the central evaluation unit/office within your Organization and reporting lines:

- Independent unit; Head reporting directly to the Head of Organization and/or Governing Bodies
- Independent unit; Head not reporting directly to the Head of Organization and/or Governing Bodies

- Part of internal oversight, head reporting to Head of Organization and/or Governing Bodies
  - Part of RBM office
  - Part of budget office
  - Part of programming/ planning office
  - Other (please specify)
- 
- 

3.6 Has the organizational placement of the central evaluation unit/office changed since the introduction of RBM?

- Yes    No    Partially

If yes, please specify in what way:

---



---

#### **4. Role and responsibilities**

4.1 Please indicate below the tasks performed by the central evaluation unit/office, decentralized evaluation units/offices, the planning and programming units/offices as well as the budget unit/office within your Organization (check as many as apply):

	Central evaluation	Decentralized evaluation	Planning and programming	Budget
Validate performance data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinate self-evaluations by Program Managers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality assurance of self-evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality assurance of self-evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conduct “internal“ independent evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manage “external” independent evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prepare organization-wide policies, guidelines, methodologies for conducting evaluations, including self-evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Compilation of lessons learned from evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dissemination of lessons learned from evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing guidance on evaluation to decentralized evaluation functions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing advice and support to program managers for conducting self-evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing advice and support to program managers for preparing performance assessment reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing RBM technical support to program managers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participation in preparation of RBM planning frameworks (strategic frameworks, program and budgets, etc)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing RBM quality assurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tracking the follow-up to evaluations (implementation of recommendations)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development of evaluation plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conducting evaluation capacity building activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conducting RBM capacity building activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Is the evaluation function systematically involved in internal discussions on the further development of RBM within the organization?

Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

---



---

If no, what do you think the reason is:

---



---

4.3 Is the evaluation function involved in discussions with Member States / Governing Bodies on the implementation of RBM?

Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

---

---

If no, what do you think the reason is:

---

---

4.4 Is the evaluation function involved in any inter-agency RBM initiatives?

Yes  No

If yes, please specify:

---

---

If no, what do you think the reason is:

---

---

4.5 Additional comments, if any:

---

---