UN-SWAP
Evaluation Performance Indicator
2015 Reporting Cycle

Sabrina Evangelista, Evaluation Specialist, UN Women

46 Entities reported the UN-SWAP EPI was applicable in 2015



10 (22%)
Entities had an external review

External companies:
IFAD, ILO, UNDP, UNICEF, UN Women, UNEP and WFP

Peer Learning Exchange:
DPI, OHCHR, UNEP, UNESCO

Figure 1. Number of entities per total in reporting category by UNEG scorecard usage (N=47)



Figure 2. Number of entities per reporting category and type of review (N = 31)



Out of the 31 entities that used the UNEG scorecard, those with internal reviews were about 4 times more likely than those with an external perspective to score exceeds or meeting requirements.

Table 1. Disaggregated results for UN entities using the UNEG Scorecard (N=31)

# Reports → Rating ↓	1-2 Reports	3-5 Reports	6-10 Reports	11-15 Reports	21 or more reports
Exceeds	UNRWA	OHCHR^	OIOS ESCWA		
Meets	DSS OCHA UNCDF	ESCAP ITC WHO WIPO	ECLAC	UNFPA**	FAO IFAD** WFP**
Approaches	DPI^	UN Habitat UNV	GEF[1] IOM UNCTAD	UNESCO^ UNODC UNOV	UNDP** ILO** UN Women** UNICEF**
Missing	ECE				UNEP^**

^Participated in PLE
**External Review
[1]GEF is included in this table and section, but not in the overall aggregate figures reported in the report, as they are not an official reporting entity to the UN-SWAP in 2015

Figure 3. Average score by criteria and type of review



UNEG EPI Scorecard Scoring Criteria	
0	not at all integrated
1	partially integrated
2	satisfactorily integrated
3	fully integrated

Figure 4. Aggregate Evaluation Performance Indicator Rating, 2015 Reporting Cycle (N=46)



Figure 5. Rating by type of entity (for both entities that did/not use UNEG Scorecard)



Projections show that 100% compliance with the evaluation indicator will not be met until 2033