

Annual
General
Meeting
2019



UNEG
United Nations Evaluation Group

UNEG Working Group 2018-2019 Reports

Dates: 16-17 May 2019

Location: Room 3, UN Gigiri Compound, Nairobi

Hosts: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and United Nations Human Settlements Programme

This document contains the work reports (activities, progress) of the UNEG Working Groups 2018-2019.

See also:

- [UNEG Work Plan 2018-2019](#).

Strategic Objective 1: Evaluation functions and products of UN entities meet the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation	3
Decentralized Evaluation Interest Group.....	3
Ethics and Code of Conduct Task Force	5
Peer Review Working Group.....	7
Professionalisation Working Group	11
Strategic Objective 2: UN entities and partners use evaluation in support of accountability and programme learning	14
UNDAF Task Force	14
Use of Evaluation Interest Group	17
Strategic Objective 3: Evaluation informs UN system-wide initiatives and emerging demands	18
DAC Criteria Task Force.....	18
Human Rights and Gender Equality Working Group.....	21
Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group.....	24
SDGs Working Group	27
Partnerships	29
Partnership Working Group.....	29
Group on Evaluating Policy Influence.....	32

Strategic Objective 1: Evaluation functions and products of UN entities meet the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation

Decentralized Evaluation Interest Group	
Co-Conveners: Alexandra Chambel (UNFPA), Julie Thoulouzan (WFP)	
WG members: Luisa Belli, Genny Bonomi (FAO); Guy Thijs (ILO); Christophe Franzetti, Diana Cartier (IOM); Isabel Suarez (UN Women); Heather Bryant, Richard Jones (UNDP); Kristina Leuchowius (UNDP/BPPS); Geoff Geurts (UNESCO); Reginald Chima (UNFPA); Fabio Sabatini, Lori Bell, Riccardo Polastro (UNICEF); Sandra Koch; Hendrik Smid (UNV); Jacqueline Flentge, Federica Zelada, Grace Igweta, Roberto Borlini, Ivan Touza, Filippo Pompili (WFP)	
Nature of work:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchange of experiences and best practices in relation to decentralized evaluations through webinars • Support evaluation partnerships and practices 	
Results achieved:	
3 webinars delivered on the following priority themes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff evaluation capacity building (December 2018) • Key lessons on the management of Joint Decentralized Evaluations (February 2019) • Ensuring complementarity between decentralized and centralized evaluation plans (April 2019) 	
Organization of a session on Joint Evaluations as part of the next EPE (to be delivered in May 2019)	
Points for discussion at the AGM:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key insights from the 3 webinars • Reflection on how UNEG can further stimulate the uptake of joint evaluations and support those. 	
Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM: Proposed Work Plan 2019-2020 (see below)	
Financial Reporting	
The Group did not request any financial contributions from the UNEG funds nor did it receive any direct financial contributions from members for its activities	
In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of Working Group by group members	
Member Agency	Type of contribution
UNFPA EO	Management of the google drive platform for DEIG; store and update relevant information (DEIG minutes; recordings; presentations, etc.)
Next steps	
Areas for future/ continued work:	
As per DEIG workplan:	
Organize subsequent webinars on topics including:	
(i) Securing and tracking staffing and financial resources for decentralized evaluations;	

- (ii) Safeguarding the impartiality of Decentralized Evaluations and addressing potential breaches;
- (iii) Quality Support mechanisms for Decentralized Evaluations: Internal vs Outsourced approaches.

Explore feasibility of sharing and consolidating Agencies' respective decentralized evaluation plans with the view to identify potential opportunities for joint evaluations.

Invite Regional Evaluation Networks to present their joint initiatives

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020: Not applicable

Ethics and Code of Conduct Task Force

Co-Conveners: Tina Tordjman-Nebe (UNICEF) and Gaby Duffy (WFP)

WG members: Arild Hauge, Deqa Ibrahim Musa (UNDP); Simon Bettighoffer (ITC)

Nature of work: Revision/Updating of the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct – Phase 1 review and mapping of existing ethical guidance and standards.

Results achieved:

A comprehensive literature review of ethical guidance and standards conducted that identifies gaps and new ideas/areas around principled action. Specifically:

- Scope of review defined and TORs developed.
- Comprehensive electronic literature library built.
- A highly qualified and experienced consultant recruited.
- Review completed - developed an inception report, conducted a comprehensive literature review, and conducted a practice review through surveys and key informant interviews with UNEG members and external key informants, carried out a critical appraisal of the 2018 UNEG ethical guidelines and code of conduct.
- The findings of the review are reflected in a draft final Mapping Report that will be presented to UNEG at the AGM.

Contribution to the Strategic Objective: This work will contribute to ensuring that UN evaluations meet UNEG Norms and Standards. Specifically, it is expected to improve the quality of evaluations conducted by UNEG members through the application of updated UNEG ethical guidelines and code of conduct. The activity is also expected to build greater awareness and engagement on ethics in evaluation in the UNEG community.

Points for discussion at the AGM:

Brief presentation of the main findings and conclusions of the Mapping and Review exercise as well as of their implications for revising the UNEG ethical guidelines and code of conduct.

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

- Validation of the results of the mapping and review exercise.
- Agreement on next steps/way forward.

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent	Comment
\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000*	Consultant fees only; assignment not yet complete

*Reimbursement from UNEG pooled fund not yet requested as of April 2019

Cash/financial contribution: Direct financial contributions to Working Group activities

Member Agency	Amount
UNICEF	\$5,000
WFP	\$5,000
Total direct contributions	\$10,000

Balance

Total UNEG fund and direct contribution	\$30,000
Total WG Expenditure	\$24,000
Balance (March 2019)	\$6,000

In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to Working Group activities

Member Agency	Type of contribution
UNDP/ ITC	Staff time (TF members)
UNICEF	Staff time (Co-convenor)
WFP	Staff time (co-convenor); administrative support for recruitment of consultant and survey delivery

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

- Revision and updating of the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020: TBC

Peer Review Working Group

Co-Conveners: Mike Spilsbury (UNEP), Inga Sniukaite (UN Women) and Amir Piric (UNESCO)

WG members: Juha Uitto, Anna Viggh (GEF); Tuncay Efendioglu, Farice Gugsu (ICAO); Alan Fox, Amanuel Zerihoun (UNDP); Susanne Frueh (UNESCO); Ada Ocampo (UNICEF); Javier Guarnizo (UNIDO); Andrew Fyfe (UNCDF); Jennifer Worrell (UNHCR)

Nature of work:

Since 2005, more than 17 UNEG professional peer reviews of 13 evaluation functions of UN agencies have been carried out by Panels of professional evaluation peers. A Peer Review is a systematic examination and assessment of the performance of an organization's evaluation function by peers, with the goal of helping the reviewed organization improve its policy making, adopt best practices, and comply with established norms, standards and principles.

Peer reviews have been used for accountability and learning, and provided peer advice and exchange and support to improve evaluation systems and products. They use and promote common quality standards, primarily the UNEG Norms and Standards. Evaluation functions are defined in a broad sense that goes beyond the evaluation office/unit to cover aspects under the responsibility of other organizational actors, such as management or decentralized systems.

The main activities of this working group currently include:

- Organising full UNEG Peer Reviews upon formal request.
- Developing new modalities for review/assessment of UN Evaluation functions against UNEG Norms and Standards

Organising full UNEG Peer Reviews

The ECG / Evalnet Peer Review of IFAD was completed with the involvement of the UNEG Chair on the Panel.

There were confirmed requests for Peer Reviews from UNESCO, GEF and ICAO (for the latter, the WG are developing a suitable approach and ICAO have agreed to be a test case).

Discussion within the working group and among the UNEG Executive group raised the issue **of prioritisation of Peer Review efforts** given that the available UNEG staff time volunteering to organize and /or serve on a PR panel is quite limited and there are other high priority Working Group topics such as developing new modalities for less well-developed evaluation functions that also need attention.

It has been suggested that UNEG should prioritise allocating efforts to Peer Reviews when:

- Resources available to an evaluation function (financial and staff time) to support a review are limited.
- The evaluation function is 'emerging' or consolidating (as opposed to large and mature)
- The evaluation function has no other established review mechanism and /or has not had previously a Peer Review

UNEG Peer Review of UNESCO

UNESCO confirmed that a UNEG Peer Review Process should be launched in the 3rd or 4th quarter of 2019. Draft ToRs are being prepared using recently completed PR ToRs as a guide. Two UNEG Heads have put their names forward to serve as Chair of the Panel and Evalnet participation has been requested. Participation of an additional panel member (a Senior Staff member or a UNEG Head) is still being sought.

Professional Peer Review of GEF IEO

The GEF IEO informed the PR WG early in 2019 that it will move forward with a Professional Peer Review, (not a full UNEG Peer Review). The draft ToRs have been prepared for approval by the GEF Council. The GEF IEO have identified a former UNEG Chair to lead the Professional Peer Review Panel. The Professional Peer Review ToRs broadly follow the UNEG approach but do not specifically request the involvement of evaluation professionals from UNEG, the Evalnet Network, or the ECG. The UNEG PR Working Group will have no formal role in this review but will offer support and guidance on request.

UNEG Peer-validated Self-Assessment of ICAO

ICAO confirmed request for a review of its evaluation function and expressed its willingness to participate as a ‘test-case’ for a new review modality being developed by the Working Group see below. Whilst ICAO is willing to volunteer to be the ‘test case’ for the new modality they stressed that the new modality should be something that is repeated and be a review approach that gains general acceptance in the UNEG community.

Use of UNEG Funding for Peer Reviews.

The established practice is for the UNEG Member evaluation function that is being reviewed to fund the direct costs of a Peer Review (consultant plus consultant travel) wherever possible. It has also been the norm that Peer Review Panel members (both UNEG and Evalnet) volunteer their own time and cover their own travel costs to participate wherever possible.

However, the financial situation of the evaluation function that is being reviewed and the volunteering panel members varies. Therefore, any financial support from UNEG sources should be **considered on a case by case basis**. The level of financial support from UNEG will depend upon the resources available from the organisation being reviewed and the travel resources available to UNEG members offering to serve on a Peer Review Panel.

The WG suggests that it is prudent to assume a default UNEG contribution of \$15,000 per Peer Review. Recent Peer Reviews have been in the range of \$30,000 (UNODC) to \$60,000 (UNICEF). Often a large proportion of Peer Review expenditures are consumed by hiring a consultant advisor to collate information, participate in the panel visits and assist in the preparation of the Peer Review report. It is anticipated that a UNEG Peer-Validated Self-assessment will be a less costly exercise.

Developing and testing new assessment approaches

A long-standing need often expressed by smaller evaluation functions within the UNEG membership, is for the Peer Review Working Group to develop a review approach that is tailored to their needs in terms of scope, time and cost of a review yet has sufficiently robust methods to be considered a credible assessment process. The PR Working Group set out a range of assessment modalities that may be suitable for smaller evaluation functions in at the 2018 AGM. These included:

- UNEG Peer-Validated Self-Assessment/ with or without EvalNet participation
- UNEG-Validated Self-Assessment (using a ‘UNEG Accredited’ consultant)
- A publicly disclosed Self-Assessment against UNEG Norms and Standards

The WG is developing a method and approach for a UNEG Peer-validated Self -assessment. The approach will be tested and put forward for endorsement by UNEG membership as an accepted review modality. The work began by collating documents relevant to developing a framework for the new modality. This included the normative framework used in UNEG Peer Reviews, JUI Maturity Matrix, OIOS Evaluation Scorecard/Dashboard Method, Mopan KPIs for Evaluation and the old UNEG Quality Stamp (a self-assessment checklist against Norms and Standards). Building on existing assessment processes for evaluation functions that already have a measure of acceptance, credibility and legitimacy was regarded by WG members as a good starting point. UNCDF and ICAO are developing a concept note for an approach to

peer-validated 'light' self-assessments which could be applied to all interested UNEG members. This could then be used/adapted to the specific entity in question depending on their mandate/particular interest – e.g ICAO for a peer review to be conducted in the second half of the year.

In so doing, it is important in terms of the normative framework for these assessments to identify mandatory assessment criteria (e.g. gender following the UN SWAP process) versus voluntary criteria (such as support to national evaluation capacity development) taken from the broader norms and standards. The concept note will propose a standard process to conduct these peer reviews covering mandatory and voluntary elements.

It is hoped that the concept note will be available for comments and discussion by the time of the AGM.

Updating UNEG guidance on Peer Reviews to cover new modalities

A natural follow up to the work on new review modalities will be to update the Peer Review Guidance accordingly. No work has been undertaken on this topic in 2018-2019.

Reviewing utility of completed Peer Reviews

Finally, to better understand the importance and utility of Peer Reviews, a review of implementation of management responses / recommendations for peer reviews is proposed. No work has been undertaken on this topic in 2018-2019.

Results achieved:

- UNEG Chair participated in the Peer Review of IFAD (conducted under ECG auspices)
- New UNEG Peer-Validated Self-assessment modality under preparation
- UNESCO - a full Peer Review has been requested for initiation second half of 2019

Contribution to the Strategic Objective:

- Strengthened strategic, technical and managerial skills of UN evaluators at all levels
- UNEG Norms and Standards met by UN evaluation functions and products

Points for discussion at the AGM:

The concept note outlining the approach to Peer Validated Self-Assessments of an Evaluation Function which is currently under development. The proposed modality needs the broader ownership of the UNEG membership

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM: See below areas for future/ continued work

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent
\$0	Up to \$15,000 per Peer Review	\$0

No direct financial or in-kind contributions were made to the WG activities.

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

- **Organising full UNEG Peer Reviews upon formal request.**
UNESCO Peer Review to be launched 2nd half of 2019

- **Developing, refining and testing new modalities for review/assessment of UN Evaluation functions against UNEG Norms and Standards**

Work on developing a UNEG Peer-validated Self-assessment approach will continue (without pause) following the AGM in preparation for a test case on ICAO to be launched 2nd half of 2019.

- **Updating UNEG guidance on Peer Reviews to cover new modalities**

Guidance and documentation that covers 'full' UNEG Peer Reviews and the new modality(ies) will be initiated after completion of the ICAO test case. (late 2019 early 2020)

- **Reviewing utility of completed Peer Reviews**

To better understand and document the importance and utility of Peer Reviews, a review of implementation of management responses / recommendations for peer reviews is proposed.

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020:

- \$15,000 for the UNEG Peer Review of UNESCO
- \$15,000 for the UNEG Peer Validated Self-assessment of ICAO

Professionalisation Working Group

Co-Conveners: Craig Russon (ILO), Lukasz Wieczerzak (OPCW) and Jacqueline Flentge (WFP)

WG members: Anguel Anastassov (IAEA); Numayr Chowdhury (JIU); Heather Bryant, Yogesh Kumar Bhatt (UNDP); Emilie Wiinblad Mathez (UNHCR); Ada Ocampo (UNICEF); Muge Dolun (UNIDO); Brook Boyer (UNITAR); Sabrina Evangelista (UN Women); Celine Caira (WIPO)

Nature of work:

Under Strategic Objective 1 of the (UNEG) Strategy 2014-2019, the Working Group on Professionalization (WGP) works on UNEG's vision to advance the professionalization of evaluation within the UN system, and to promote adherence to the norms and standards through the external review processes of evaluation functions, the development of relevant guidance materials, as well as the development of a professional competency framework for UN evaluators. The working group aims to strengthen the strategic, technical and managerial skills of UN evaluators by facilitating the exchange of knowledge and experiences.

Results achieved:

Pillars 1 and 4: Roundtable at AfREA as well as Panel, including a presentation of the comparative study that WG is coordinating

Pillar 2: Information on UN and other organization's training announcements, curricula, and professionalization initiatives collected and structured. The Pillar has created an initial mock-up developed for the addition to the UNEG website which will house this information.

Pillar 3 and 4: In collaboration with UNSSCC, the PWG has organized a workshop on managing UN Evaluations in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The work shop, hosted by UNICEF, is scheduled for 28 – 30 May 2019 in New York, USA. There have been challenges to the development of the programme. As of today, only 9 participants have expressed interest to join the course. Out of the 9, only one has paid.

Pillar 5: the organization and delivery of the Round Table and Panel on Professionalization in the AFREA conference (mentioned under previous pillars) leveraged important insights on the strategy to follow for the WG, under the new UNEG Strategic Plan.

Contribution to the Strategic Objective:

Through its work on the UNEG ECF, the PWG is positioning itself as one of the interlocutors in a conversation on desirability and feasibility of a global competency framework. Such a framework could a) facilitate recruitment of evaluators across the globe; 2) facilitate the construction of frameworks for evaluation associations that do not have one already; and 3) form the base for the establishment of global professional recognition schemes.

Points for discussion at the AGM: - UNEG Strategy should better reflect

- a) How will WG's be consulted on the contents of the new Strategic Plan? The Professionalization part will be extensive in the UNEG Strategy, and in terms of global engagement it would be important for WG members to have the opportunity to reflect and discuss with the Executive Group on the way forward in terms of UNEG's position on professionalization (global leader/ partner or focus on UNEG member

functions; Position in terms of lobbying for an Evaluation Job Family; possible work on global competency framework and on professional recognition systems. A short agenda point on the AGM agenda, does not seem sufficient for this purpose. An instance would be welcomed where more time is available, as well as where WG pillar leads can all be present.

- b) A core part of WGP's work is to move the global agenda forward in terms of the thinking around the before mentioned topics. The practice of holding Round Table meetings alongside conferences has been very successful so far. There is momentum and explicit demand for another RT to happen -to get more concrete- in the AEA conference. After AEA, however, it seems not possible for agencies to again cost WG- staff travel for this purpose.
- c) The PWG seeks confirmation from the EG on capacity in which UNSSC is participating in Pillar 3. Is UNSSC a partner or a member of the PWG? There were no clear answers, but members of the group unanimously thought that UNSSC should be a partner rather than a member.

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

- As above

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

	Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent	Comment
	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	UNICEF issued contract- Benoit Gauthier
	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	Webpage development
Total	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$20,000	

The WG has a balance of \$5,000 from UNEG funds going into 2019/2020.

Cash/financial contribution (non-UNEG funds): Direct financial contributions to Working Group activities

Member Agency	Amount	Comments
UNICEF	\$5,000	Travel expenses for Benoit Gauthier to AfrEA conference
UNICEF	\$4,000	Travel expenses for s/m Ada Ocampo to AfrEA conference
UNIDO	\$2,500	Travel expenses for s/m Müge Dolun to AfrEA conference
WFP	\$1,000	Part time UNV supporting WG (since 02/2019 progress rpt)
WFP	\$8,000	Bursaries for people to participate in UNEG organized Round Table and Panel in AfrEA conference
Total direct contribution	\$20,500	

In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution
UNIDO	Staff time for coordination, M. Dolun
WFP	Staff time for coordination, J.Flentge (plus UNV-see above)

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

- Finalization of the draft report summarizing the Round Table meeting and Panel presentation/discussion that were presented at the AfrEA conference.
- Funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020: Travel expenses to American Evaluation Association RT and TT (indicative \$15,000; follow-up consultancy work in 2020 \$20,000)
- Support UNSSC
- Paper for publication AFREA; Preparations for the AEA conference
- Preparations for reporting to AGM during UNEG week

Strategic Objective 2: UN entities and partners use evaluation in support of accountability and programme learning

UNDAF Task Force

Co-Conveners: Masahiro Igarashi (FAO) and Fumika Ouchi (UNDP)

WG members: Omar Awabdeh (FAO); Eduardo Toscani (IAEA); Mar Guinot, Natalia Acosta, Richard Jones (UNDP); Nina Rai (UNDP); Supprimaniyam Nanthikesan (UNFPA); Sergio Lenci (UNFPA/ LACRO); Fabio Sabatini (UNICEF); Messay Tassew, Isabel Suarez, Shravanti Reddy (UN Women); Grace Igweta (WFP); Adan Ruiz (WIPO)

Nature of work:

1. Engagement with UNDCO to provide inputs to the new UNDAF guideline development process
2. Review of methodology and practices of country-level evaluations by UNEG member agencies
3. Mapping of country-level evaluation plans
4. Development of UNDAF evaluation concept note
5. Pilot UNDAF evaluations led by UNEG members

Results achieved:

1. Active participation in two steams of the new UNDAF guidelines design team, and continued engagement to provide inputs at the revision stage
2. Methodologies collected (7 members); TOR of the review drafted; awaiting the conclusion of the new UNDAF guideline development
3. Mapping of UNDAF and country-programme evaluations (7 agencies) for 2019-2020 completed
4. A concept note prepared, to be completed for piloting and eventually to be converted to a manual for UNDAF evaluation manager and teams
5. Some consultations held with UNRCs but waiting for the new UNDAF guidelines to be developed and pilot countries identified

Contribution to the Strategic Objective:

This will ultimately be UNEG contribution to UN system-wide accountability on its development cooperation.

- It will also provide a model for country-owned or country-centred evaluations in their efforts to achieve SDGs since it will assess multi-actor contributions to high-level development objectives.
- By improving the process and quality of UNDAF evaluations, it is hoped that evaluation principles and methodologies are better understood by UN managers in the field, bridging the critical gap between centralized and decentralized evaluation regimes.
- It is also hoped that UNEG members learn to collaborate for a larger objective than just doing their own thing as they want.

Points for discussion at the AGM:

For UNEG to make serious contribution to UN system-wide accountability, UNEG members need to collaborate in a more-substantive manner. We propose to develop agreements on:

(a) a methodology to conduct joint country-level and UNDAF evaluations with agency inputs at the outcome level;

(b) a plan for joint country-level and UNDAF pilot evaluations;

(c) a common proposal to governing bodies and/or management that mandates and plans for country-level evaluations need to be aligned with others if UNEG members are to respond to system-wide calls.

WG plans to prepare white papers to this end.

Some points for discussion:

- UNEG has tried for harmonization of evaluation plans in the past, but in vain. Can we be serious this time, putting aside the differences for greater goods?
- For system-wide accountability, the alignment and coordination cannot stop at full-fledged country programme evaluations conducted by large evaluation offices (7 agencies). It should include all types of evaluations conducted at the country level. Each one of us need to answer the question *“how would you provide the assessment of the contribution of your agency activities to UNDAF objectives?”*
 - If a member does not conduct country-level evaluations, would it be ready to adjust their work and think seriously how to cover it?
 - If a member does not take decentralized (project) evaluations seriously, can it now take a serious look and see how we can make it credible and high-quality that contributes to UNDAF evaluations?

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

Can we be serious in supporting system-wide accountability and agree to join forces so as to:

- (a) Make country-level joint evaluations reality with meaningful number of agency participations;
- (b) Work to align evaluation methodologies and plans as needed for joint country-level and UNDAF evaluations
- (c) Ensure contributions from evaluations that are not fully-fledged country-programme evaluations to UNDAF evaluations
- (d) Explain to governing bodies and/or management as needed if changes in mandates and plans are required

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent	Comment
\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	Work on UNDAF Guidelines took priority.

The WG has a balance of \$10,000 from UNEG funds going into 2019/2020

No direct financial contributions were made to Working Group activities.

In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution	Outcome/Remarks
UN Women	Staff Time	Inputs to UNDAF Guidelines design and revision process, preparatory work on methodology review
UNDP	Staff Time	Mapping of country-programme and UNDAF evaluations for 2019-2020
FAO	Staff Time, two missions to NY for workshops	Inputs to UNDAF Guidelines and other materials, consultation with RCs, preparation of concept notes
Other members (IAEA, UNODC, etc.)	Staff time	WG meetings and sub-group contributions

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

1. Continued engagement with UNDCO, and other key partners involved in the reform process
2. First iteration of methodology review work (country programme evaluations); the second iteration is to look at other country-level evaluations – towards the development of methodologies for (a) joint country-level evaluations and (b) UNDAF evaluations
3. Mapping of UNDAF and country-level evaluations – towards the agreed plan for joint country-level evaluations and UNDAF evaluation pilots
4. Development of a workable UNDAF methodology with inputs from agency evaluations and coverage of other activities – towards UNDAF evaluation manual
5. Pilot of UNDAF evaluations applying the new methodology and led by experienced country-level evaluators from UNEG members to test the methodology and learn lessons – towards methodology revision and lessons learnt paper

Funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020:

- Pilot UNDAF evaluations (tentatively two countries, to be discussed)

Use of Evaluation Interest Group

Co-Conveners: Adan Ruiz Villalba (WIPO) and Aurelie Larmoyer (FAO)

WG members: Maria Alice Moz Christofolletti, Federica Bottamedi (FAO); Kseniya Temnenko (GEF); Soo Mee Baumann, Kamolmas Jaiyen (IAEA); Mini Thakur, Janette Murawski (ILO); Juan Carlos Pena (OIOS); Caspar Merkle (UN Women); Ana Rosa Soares (UNDP); Moritz Bilagher, Martina Rathner, Claudia Iburguen (UNESCO); Neha Karkara (UNFPA); Fabio Sabatini, Lovemore Mhuriyengwe, Uyen Kim Huynh (UNICEF); Deborah McWhinney, Ivan Touza (WFP)

Nature of work: Promote the use evaluation among UNEG members

Results achieved: Zero draft on good practices to increase evaluation use across UNEG members

Contribution to the Strategic Objective:

Points for discussion at the AGM: Orientation and focus on group objectives to reach out to external audiences and stakeholders beyond UNEG members.

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM (if any): Document of good practices for review and comments of UNEG members. New objectives and focus of the group to be decided upon.

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent	Comment
\$5,000	\$5,000	\$0	Amount requested 3rd week of March for a 10 day consultant contract to be executed in April.

No direct financial contributions were made to Working Group activities

In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution
FAO, WIPO	Coordination, data collection, analysis, drafting, consultant management and review
IAEA, ILO, UN Women, GEF, UNFPA	Data collection, Analysis, drafting and review
WFP, GEF, UNESCO, UNICEF	Data collection and review

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work: As the new strategic objectives of UNEG in relation with evaluation use is putting the focus on influence of evaluation in policy across the UN system, the areas of work might need to move accordingly to cover and reach out to external stakeholders, e.g Study on the Impact of evaluation use. Evaluation Synthesis etc.

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020: If the decision is to refocus strategic objectives and reach out to external audiences it is anticipated funds will be requested.

Strategic Objective 3: Evaluation informs UN system-wide initiatives and emerging demands

DAC Criteria Task Force

Co-Conveners: Peter E. Wichmand, ILO; Julia Engelhardt, WIPO; Vadivelu Vijayalakshmi, UNDP

WG members: Mikal Khan, Amélie Solal-Celigny, Carlos Tarazona (FAO); Leslie Thomas (IAEA); Mona Selim (UN Women); Andrew Fyfe, (UNCDF); David Slattery, Vijaya Vadivelu (UNDP); Louis Charpentier, Hicham Daoudi (UNFPA); Nabila Hameed (UNHCR); Tina Tordjman-Nebe, Jeremie Toubkiss (UNICEF); Thuy Thu Le (UNIDO); Carlotta Tincati, Raed Tailakh (UNRWA); Anne-Claire Luzot (WFP); Julia Engelhardt (WIPO)

Nature of work:

- a) To provide comments on the criteria and documents taking into consideration relevant UNEG guidance document such as on UNEG Norms and Standards, normative evaluations, human rights and gender perspectives and other
- b) Organize opinion of all members and bring it to the OECD DAC. Are we looking at what is the use of these criteria? How this can be used in the UN and by the governments?
- c) How UNEG agencies interpret the criteria and to agree in interpreting the criteria in the same way (basis for any joint, coordinated evaluation).

Results achieved:

1. Survey to UNEG heads on UN system specific responses to key OECD/DAC Evaluation criteria consultations with consolidated responses provided to OECD/DAC consultant analysing the responses to the global OECD/DAC consultations
2. Collecting and structuring input from UNEG heads to the draft revised criteria (March 2019) and providing this collection of input to the UNEG Chair for use in DAC/OECD EvalNet discussions
3. Organising an EPE sessions at UNEG Week May 2019 to serve as the consultation with OECD/DAC on the latest proposed revised criteria through participation of OECD/DAC colleagues and to serve as the detailed discussions on the implications and further use by the UNEG in the context of the SDG and reforms of the UN development system

Contribution to the Strategic Objective:

DAC criteria is part of the foundation for evaluation and the appropriate use of these in evaluation work within the UN system will be part of how evaluations inform UN system wide initiatives and emerging demands. Informing the revisions of the DAC Criteria for the evaluation in the UN system and the implications of the revisions is therefore important for UNEG to review and consider, including identifying follow-up action. This is what the DAC TF has attempted to focus on. It should be noted that revision of DAC Criteria and its appropriate use in the UN system evaluation is also potentially contributing to other strategic objectives, in particular SO1 on Norms and Standards (criteria part of basis of evaluation and SO4 on enhanced global evaluation profession (appropriate use of the criteria for national level evaluations and beyond external funding); and even SO2 on the use of evaluations by possible enhancing the relevance and usefulness of evaluations if more appropriate criteria are used.

Points for discussion at the AGM:

The objective of the EPE session is firstly to have consultations with OECD/DAC on UNEG's views to on the new criteria and implications for evaluation in the UN system context; and secondly to identify any areas of future work for UNEG on this topic. The session will focus on how UNEG can consider further how the revised criteria are useful, appropriate in UN context and how the formulation of the issue, the use of dimensions and the "examples of areas of consideration (= UN agency/system areas of consideration?) will provide the basis within the overall criteria.

The EPE session is intended to carry forward key points for considerations by the AGM on the way forward for UNEG related to the revised OECD/DAC criteria, including the future role, if any, of the DAC criteria task force.

Previous identified areas of work in costed work plan for the future phase includes, but not limited to: a) Prepare modules and guidance material for UNEG members on the new criteria; b) Prepare modules and guidance for Governments on the new criteria; and c) consider the change of the Task Force into a UNEG interest group or working group

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

Based on key points from the EPE session on the implications of the revised DAC criteria for UNEG, agree on the way forward for UNEG on the revised DAC Criteria and the future role of the DAC TF

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent	Comment
\$15,000	\$0	\$0	Initial costed work plan proposed to engage a consultant to assist with desk review and consultations to prepare a UNEG paper. Timeline did not make this possible and the amount was not approved. Survey to UNEG used instead and preparation of compiled responses and collection of input prepared by TF. Depending on decision on implications of the revised criteria, similar amounts could be foreseen in the future.

No direct financial contributions were made to Working Group activities.

In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of the Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution	Outcome/Remarks
ILO	Considerable technical advisory and coordination/preparation of inputs	Timely preparation of inputs
WIPO	Skype and meeting facilities	TF meetings organised
FAO	Lead role in organising the EPE session	EPE session in Nairobi May 2019

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

Based on key points from the EPE session on the implications of the revised DAC criteria for UNEG, agree on the way forward for UNEG on the revised DAC Criteria and the future role of the DAC TF including future continued work such as the possible areas outlined above.

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020:

Initial costed work plan proposed an amount of \$15,000 which is likely to be the minimum level also required for the future, but this will depend on the precise areas of work decided on.

Human Rights and Gender Equality Working Group

Co-Conveners: Messay Tassew (UN Women) and Sabas Monroy (OHCHR)

WG members: Arwa Khalid (FAO); Anna Viggh (GEF); Patricia Vidal (ILO); Marianne Schmitt (ITC); Michael Craft (OIOS); Christophe Legrand (UNCDF); Heather Bryant (UNDP); Claudia Ibaergen, Katia Sediakina-Riviere (UNESCO); Emilie Wiinblad Mathez (UNHCR); Mathew Varghese, Laurence Reichel (UNICEF); Muge Dolun (UNIDO); Felix Herzog (UNESCWA); Dawit Habtemariam (WFP); Anand Sivasankara-Kurup (WHO); Natalie Raaber (UNFPA)

Nature of work:

- d) Strengthening UNEG members' knowledge/awareness and skills in integrating GE&HR in evaluation practice in order to meet the UNEG norms and standards.
- e) Leading efforts of development of guidance, tools and checklists on integration of human rights and gender equality into evaluation processes and systems of UNEG members.

Revision of the Technical Note on the UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator and Scorecard

In the context of the overall UN-SWAP 2.0 revision, changes to the UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator received endorsement by UNEG heads after extensive consultations with members on the HR&GE Working Group and the broader UN SWAP reporting entities. The revised Technical Note and scorecard was uploaded on the UNEG website and shared widely including through a webinar. This year the working group supported 4 entities (UNCDF, UNIDO, UN-Habitat and UN Human Rights) to engage in Peer Learning Exchange, which has proven to be very helpful for entities. The lessons learned through PLE and the trends in reporting will be analysed and shared during the UNEG AGM in May 2019. The new framework came into effect in 2018 and 42 UN entities across the UN System reported against it.

UNDAF evaluation meta-analysis with a gender lens

The Working Group commissioned the UNDAF evaluations meta-synthesis with a gender lens. The overall analysis has two key deliverables. The first is to assess the gender responsiveness of 50 sampled evaluations while the second deliverable is to carry out a meta-synthesis of UNDAF evaluations on gender equality results which will include an in-depth systemic review and analysis of evidence on the twin-track approach for gender mainstreaming.

Through a competitive process, a suitable consultant has been recruited to support the execution of this activity. Inception report has been produced after several iterative processes and presented to members of the group. The report is expected to be completed in June 2019. A management group drawn from: UN Women, OIOS, UNESCO, WFP, WHO, ILO, UNDP, UN Human Rights, and UNFPA has been established to ensure a participatory approach and coordination of ideas and inputs during the entire process. In total, 68 evaluations, comprised of 30 evaluations from Africa, 5 from the Arab States, 14 from the Asia and Pacific, 9 from Europe and Central Independent States and ten from Latin America were identified to support the analysis.

Finalization of guidance on evaluating corporate gender mainstreaming

After the endorsement by UNEG heads during the 2018 AGM, the Working Group finalized the guidance on evaluating corporate gender mainstreaming. The guidance has been formatted and uploaded to the UNEG website.

Disability SWAP

As per the ad-hoc request, the HR&GE Working Group reviewed and commented on the on-going system wide process to develop a policy and accountability framework on disability with special focus on evaluation indicator

Contribution to the Strategic Objective:

The activities executed by the group contributed to sharing knowledge in integrating GE&HR in evaluation practice as well as compliance with the UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator requirements. Once finalized, the UNDAF meta-synthesis will be instrumental to potentially inform development and implementation of future UNDAFs and new generation of UNDAF evaluations. The Guidance on Corporate Gender Mainstreaming will be a vital instrument to encourage UN entities as well as evaluation offices to commission a corporate evaluation on the performance of the gender policy, strategy or equivalent, which is also a requirement as per the revised UN SWAP framework.

Points for discussion at the AGM:

- Emerging findings from the UNDAF meta-synthesis
- Findings from the 2018 UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator synthesis
- 2019/2020 Work Plan

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

- 2019/2020 Work Plan (see below)

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent	Comment
\$53,000	\$53,000	\$0	To be spent in June 2019 for UNDAF meta-synthesis

In 2015, UN Women made an earmarked contribution of \$78k to advance integration of gender and human rights in evaluations.

Once the costs of the UNDAF meta-synthesis are processed an outstanding balance of \$25,000 will remain that will be used to advance implementation of the HR&GE WG activities in 2019/20..

Cash/financial contribution: Direct financial contributions to Working Group activities

Member Agency	Amount (in USD)	Comments
UN Women	\$78,000	Earmarked contribution made in 2015.

In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution including administrative support
UN Women	Co-convener role and provision of leadership and coordination on WG activities including recruitment and management of consultant for the UNDAF meta-synthesis; UN SWAP EPI annual synthesis of results; and review of different products
OHCHR	Co-convener role and provision of leadership and coordination on WG activities including recruitment of consultant for the UNDAF meta-synthesis and staff time for review of different products
OIOS	Co-lead role for UNDAF meta-synthesis including technical and quality assurance support
UNDP	Lead role in recruitment of consultant for the UNDAF meta-synthesis, technical and quality assurance support
WFP	Technical and quality assurance support for the UNDAF meta-synthesis; webinar on UN SWAP revised scorecard
UNESCO	Support to recruitment of consultant for the UNDAF meta-synthesis; technical and quality assurance support for different activities of the WG including UN SWAP Technical Note
ILO/ ITC	Technical and quality assurance support for the UNDAF meta-synthesis
UNESCWA	Technical and quality assurance support to finalization and webinar on UN SWAP Technical Note
UNICEF	Technical and quality assurance support for finalization of the UN SWAP Technical Note
UNFPA	Technical and quality assurance support for finalization of the UN SWAP Technical Note and UNDAF meta-synthesis
UNIDO/ WHO	Inputs to working group activities

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

- Finalization and dissemination of the final report of UNDAF evaluations meta-synthesis through various channels including webinar.
- Support development of technical guidance and roll-out of the policy and accountability framework on disability with special focus on evaluation indicator.
- Facilitate collective space for exchange on '*corporate evaluation of gender mainstreaming policy, strategy or equivalent*' across reporting entities, including discussion of good practices and common challenges.
- UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator 2019 Annual Synthesis of results and webinar

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020:

\$25,000 (remaining amount from the funds committed by UN Women to the HR&GE Working Group.

Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group

Co-Conveners: Jane Mwangi (UNICEF), Shravanti Reddy (UN Women) and Francesca Bonino/ Henri van den Idsert (UNHCR)

WG members: Neil Dillon (ALNAP); Marta Bruno, Sara Holst, Vinitha Johnson (FAO); Christophe Franzetti, Diana Cartier (IOM); Sofia Palli, Lenore Matthew (JIU); Mona Fetouh (OIOS), Mar Guinot (UNDP); Hicham Daoudi (UNFPA); Mari Honjo (WFP)

Nature of work:

1. Establish more formal links between HEIG and other UNEG groups and work streams in order to provide consolidated inputs to other SOs deliverables where a humanitarian evaluation perspective may be relevant. Priority engagement in 2018-19 will be with the UNEG Ethics and Code of Conduct Task Team, and – depending on internal capacities – with the Interest Group on OECD-DAC criteria.
2. With reference to the pilot of the draft HEIG “Guidance on Reflecting Humanitarian Principles (HP) in Evaluation, the group will review the pilot process to date and facilitate and convene a peer exchange on emerging practices from use of the pilot guidance, with the aim of strengthening the guide by identifying/validating key issues in evaluating HPs from the perspective of practitioners.
3. Actively engage in communication and outreach activities to disseminate and discuss the “Mapping and synthesis of evaluations on the Humanitarian Development Nexus” with different valuation practitioners’ fora also beyond UNEG.

Results achieved:

Workplan Area 1: Minimum of one set of consolidated HEIG inputs contributed to another SO activity (for cross-fertilisation purposes).

- Outreach to all UNEG TF/WG
- Collaboration with Ethics TF
 - Consolidated comments to Ethics Review ToR and Inception Report
 - Organized a focus group discussion of HEIG members with the ethics consultant
 - Plan for continued input to remaining deliverables
- Collaboration with HR & GE TF
 - Consolidated comments sought for Inception Report to UNDAF Meta-Analysis (underway)
 - Potential to input to next meta-analysis deliverable from humanitarian perspective

Workplan Area 2: Humanitarian Principles pilot guidance

Specific activities and achievements under this sub-group listed below:

- a) Carry out a series of interviews with the Eval Team Leaders/practitioners:
 - Interview guide developed
 - List of 13 practitioners identified across agencies
 - Interviews scheduled to take place between 25 March and 8 April.

- b) Develop a content map of the pilot HEIG guidance, which could also be interactive if resources for a designer were made available. This would support usability.
 - Ongoing, content guide to be developed based on interviews.
- c) Draft a HEIG HP focused blog for the ALNAP Humanitarian Evaluation Community of Practice to reach out to other eval offices / eval practitioners beyond UNEG, dependent on the information collected.
 - Ongoing, to be completed after the AGM.

Workplan Area 3: Active dissemination including through a learning brief, and discussion of the HEIG-mapping of evaluations on the Hum-Dev nexus, including presentations at relevant evaluations fora and regional conference (including EES):

- The HEIG mapping of evaluations on the H-D nexus has earlier been disseminated widely, and agencies have indicated that it has been useful as they planned and undertook H-D nexus evaluations. The study was presented at the EES Conference in October 2018.
- The H-D nexus was identified as a top priority at the WHS, and received a lot of commitments from different stakeholders, and a number of UN agencies have ongoing/planned evaluations around the nexus. There is need to share experiences amongst agencies and other stakeholders in this work. A number of Evaluation Directors, have proposed that a ‘Learning Event’ for different stakeholders be organized around the H-D nexus.
- An event organized by respective Evaluation Services, “learning” should be focused on emerging evaluative evidence and process-oriented lessons learnt from commissioning, planning and managing on the HD-Nexus evaluations. It’s been agreed to postpone this event to await the completion of some of the agencies' own evaluations. The HEIG mapping will be useful during the planning of the learning event.

Contribution to the Strategic Objective: These activities also contribute to the work of SO1 Ethics and to SO3 GE & HR

Points for discussion at the AGM:

- Understand if there is continuing interest for cross-collaboration with the HEIG, including with UNDAF TF
- Steps for finalizing the humanitarian guidance
- Extension of nexus work to ensure that the ongoing/planned evaluations can be used for the proposed learning event.

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

- How to better streamline humanitarian evaluation within UNEG products to prevent a siloed approach.

Financial Reporting

No financial contributions were requested from UNEG funds, nor were any direct financial contributions made to Working Group activities.

In-kind contributions: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution
UN Women, UNHCR, UNICEF	Staff time for co-chairing and contributing, organizing meetings, etc.
All TF Members	Contributions to TF work, attending meetings, presentations, etc. Specific agencies are also resourcing their own H-D nexus evaluations, which are critical for Workplan Area 3

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

Work Area 1: Cross-Collaboration

HEIG will continue its efforts to cross-collaboration with other UNEG TFs/WGs to act as a sounding board on relevant products building on the experience of this year.

Work Area 2: Humanitarian Principles pilot guidance

- Continue to developing HP guide content Map
- Recruitment of designer to finalize HP pilot guide (2020)
- Engagement of stakeholders for validation and buy-in for the guide

Work area 3: H-D Nexus Work

HEIG will continue to engage agencies, NGOs and other stakeholders to get a good sense of who is undertaking H-D evaluations (including likely timelines for completion); This would help shape the H-D nexus learning event (including gauging which agencies/organizations to be invited). Where necessary, HEIG will continue to make presentations of the H-D nexus mapping to different organizations and foras.

Funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020: TBD

- Funds for content designer/final revisions HP pilot guide (app. \$25,000)

SDGs Working Group

Co-Conveners: Guy Thijs (ILO) and Indran Naidoo (UNDP)

WG members: Olivier Cossée, Xuebing Sun (FAO); Geeta Batra (GEF); Christophe Franzetti, Diana CARTIER (IOM); Stefan Helck, Alexandra Capello, Nuria Castells Cabre (JIU); Srilata Rao, Robert McCouch (OIOS); Maria Kobbe (PAHO); Florencia Tateossian (UN Women); David Slattery, Vijaya Vadivelu (UNDP); Moritz Bilagher (UNESCO); Ada Ocampo (UNICEF); Javier Guarnizo (UNIDO); Katinka Koke (UNITAR); Katharina Kayser, Carlos Asenjo (UNODC); Deborah McWhinney (WFP); Itziar Larizgoitia (WHO)

Nature of work: Contribution to SO 3- SDGs and Evaluation.

Results achieved:

The Working Group have hired a consultant to prepare an inventory of existing guidelines and tools that Evaluation Offices have developed to assess evaluability issues related to the SDGs and their programmatic work. This exercise will be conducted alongside a stocktaking of existing training initiatives and materials developed to support countries in the building of national monitoring and evaluation capacity in the context of the national sustainable development strategies. These activities are expected to feed into the development of an annotated outline for SDG-relevant UNEG Guidelines and Tools on evaluability and Capacity development to support country-led Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) and other national accountability and learning processes, including the monitoring and evaluation of SDG-related indicators. An email was sent out by the UNEG chair to UNEG Heads on the 19th March informing them that the consultant would be reaching out to help develop the study and requesting their collaboration. A data collection instrument has in the meantime been developed and is being pilot-tested by ILO.

Points for discussion at the AGM:

During the AGM a report will be circulated with results of the stocktaking exercise and a presentation on most salient points made.

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

Discuss best way forward to improve coordination amongst UNEG members on evaluability and capacity development issues related to the SDGs.

Financial Reporting

Financial contribution from UNEG funds

Amount requested	Amount approved	Amount spent	Comment
\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	Money advanced by ILO, reimbursement not yet requested.

No direct financial contributions were made to Working Group activities

In-kind contribution: Significant 'in-kind' contributions to the work of Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution
ILO	Prepare TOR, Issuing of contract
UNDP/ILO/WHO	Convene meetings

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

Various streams in the approved workplan have not made any progress at all. There is need for a concerted effort by all members of the working group to expedite progress.

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020: Not applicable

Partnerships

Partnership Working Group
<p>Co-Conveners: Harvey Garcia (FAO) and Katinka Koke (UNITAR)</p> <p>WG members: Craig Russon (ILO); Masa Igarashi, Renata Mirulla, Eoghan Molloy (FAO); Celine Caira (WIPO); Maria Kobbe (PAHO); Ada Ocampo (UNICEF); Florencia Tateossian, Messay Tassew (UN Women)</p>
<p>Nature of work:</p> <p>The UNEG Partnership Working Group supports the implementation of the UNEG Partnership Strategy that was finalized and published following the UNEG Annual General Meeting in Rome in May 2018. The Partnership Strategy was prepared by the UNEG Partnership Working Group, established under Strategic Objective 4 of the UNEG Strategy 2014-2019.</p> <p>The Partnership Working Groups seeks to facilitate important partnerships within the wider evaluation community, monitor and collect lessons from the partnerships engaged by UNEG.</p>
<p>Results achieved:</p> <p><u>Work Stream 1. (Outcome 1: Promotion of UNEG Partnership Strategy)</u></p> <p>The UNEG Partnership Strategy was edited, formatted and posted online last November 2018 on the UNEG website, the UNEG Facebook Page and UNEG Twitter account. The rest of Work Stream 1 which includes brainstorming of webinars and videos related to partnerships is still pending and could carry forward as a possible area of work for 2019-2020.</p> <p><u>Work Stream 2. (Outcome 2: Formalizing existing partnerships and Outcome 3: Support emerging and new partnerships and Outcome 5: Monitoring and reporting and Outcome 6: Lessons Learning) 3</u></p> <p>We have mapped various partners of each UNEG Work Group. We have started with drafting an engagement plan with EvalPartners. We will be coordinating with the Work Groups to facilitate the drafting of engagement plans with their partners. In parallel, we are also in the process of documenting what has transpired, and what lessons can be taken from these partnerships. We hope to report on these partnerships in 2019.</p> <p><u>Work Stream 3. (Outcome 4: UNEG partnership and collaborators' webpage)</u></p> <p>We reviewed the partnership survey of 2018 to take stock on information regarding partnership needs of UNEG members. We prepared a survey to gauge the demand, use, and form of a database of non-profit evaluation service providers (e.g. VOPES, think-tanks, academe, and evaluation units within National Governments) that is accessible to UNEG members and what platform should be used. This survey was circulated in April 2019.</p>
<p>Contribution to the Strategic Objective:</p> <p>The Partnership Working Group is contributing to extending the influence of UNEG to the broader evaluation community through implementation of the UNEG Partnership Strategy. It hopes to build a culture of sustainable partnership among various UNEG Working Groups and their partners by mapping long term engagement plans, monitoring collaborations and learning from experiences.</p>
<p>Points for discussion at the AGM:</p> <p>We requested each UNEG Working Group to pilot the drafting of engagement plans with one of their partners. The next step is to monitor these partnerships, collect lessons learned, build synergies among Work Groups</p>

and their partners and roll out the engagement plan to other partners. We are interested to know if there are pressing issues that need to be addressed in some partnerships.

- What partnership issues does the AGM see the Partnership Working Group should work on moving forward?
- Who should lead the engagement with the UNEG partners that are not necessarily covered by a Working group e.g. Regional VOPEs, DAC EvalNet, ECG, IOCE, ALNAP?
- When contacted from new potential partners “from the outside”, such as the Canadian Evaluation Association, what procedure should be followed??
- Should UNEG WGs use the larger Engagement Plan of large partners (e.g. Eval Partners) as an umbrella to build “specific” engagements with units within them (e.g. Eval Gender)? Example:
 - The UNEG SO3 Gender Equality and Human Rights Working Group could develop an engagement plan with Eval Gender and use the Eval Partner Engagement plan as a springboard. This off-shoot specific engagement plan will be more nuanced, pragmatic and centered on topics of the UNEG SO3 Gender Equality and Human Rights Working Group.
 - UNEG WGs could find similar thematic workgroups in large partners such as ECG. Each UNEG WGs with the assistance of the Partnership WG could explore complementarities and potential specific forms of partnerships.
- Should UNEG could explore partnership with Evaluation functions of large foundations and donors?

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM:

- Development of a Partners database;
- Proposed budget of the Partnership working group.

Financial Reporting

No financial contributions from the UNEG funds were requested, nor were any direct financial contributions made to Working Group activities.

In-kind contribution: Significant ‘in-kind’ contributions to the work of Working Group

Member Agency	Type of contribution
FAO, ILO, PAHO/WHO, UN Women, UNICEF, UNIDO, UNITAR, WFP	Technical advisory, coordination

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

The Partnership Working Group hopes to keep the following outcomes for 2019/2020

Outcome 1: Promotion of UNEG Partnership Strategy

- Videos: Production of short videos to promote the Partnership Strategy among UNEG members and to encourage engagement with potential new partners. The video will outline the benefits of partnerships, the basic principles, and tools of UNEG Strategy, and can be used during meetings, conferences, and presentations.
- Webinar/s for UNEG members: Depending on partnerships outcomes, webinars for UNEG members can be organized to showcase activities and results of partnerships, as well as possible lessons learned and challenges.

Outcome 2: Formalizing existing partnerships

- Scale up and formalize existing partnerships: The Partnership WG will approach Agencies / contact persons that have been engaging with existing partners to develop the engagement plan. The WG will support the formalization of the partnership making sure it follows the procedure laid down in the Strategy and will collect engagement plans and agreements for the UNEG partnerships webpage.

Outcome 3: Support emerging and new partnerships

- Support emerging partnerships: The Partnership WG will contact other SO chairs and WG conveners to see whether they are engaging with new partners and, if relevant, support them in formalizing partnerships, coordinate partnership plans to avoid duplication with other WGs.
- Outreach to potential new partners: based on the criteria outlined in the Strategy, new potential partners will be approached to expand the range and coverage of activities.

Outcome 4: UNEG partnership and collaborators' webpage

- The Partnership WG will develop a list of UNEG partners accessible to all UNEG members based on the results of Item 2 and 3.
- Survey of institutes collaborating with UNEG members: based on the demand emerged from last year's survey, the Partnership WG will collect information and data of companies, universities and other institutions that provide evaluation services to UNEG members as collaborators, service providers, etc.
- A webpage on the UNEG website only accessible by UNEG members will include a repository of up to date information on partnerships and related documents as well as a list of collaborators UNEG members can refer to.

Outcome 5: Monitoring and reporting

- The Partnership WG will monitor the implementation of partnership plans and of the partnership Strategy, gather lessons for further expanding UNEG partnerships, and report at the AGM through the SO4 chair.

Outcome 6: Lessons Learning

- The Partnership WG will collect lessons learned from various UNEG SOs and WGs.

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020:

- \$5,000: Depending on the results of the survey, the Partnership WG might need the support of a consultant to design and implement the database of partners.
- \$5,000: The Partnership WG will develop material such as video and knowledge products to communicate partnerships in UNEG.
- \$15,000: This will be used to fund partnership events in forms of workshops, side events, etc. Ideally, these partnership events will be part of larger forum (e.g. VOPE conferences, NEC, etc.). It should be noted that these funds will only be used for payments of workshop venues, catering etc. It is expected that UNEG members will co-fund the travel costs.

Group on Evaluating Policy Influence

Co-Conveners: Felix Herzog (UNESCWA), Veridiana Mansour Mendes (FAO) and Julia Engelhardt (WIPO)

WG members: Andrew Fyfe, Cristophe Legrand and Pietro Tornese (UNCDF); Olivier Cossée, Nanae Yabuki and Alena Lappo (FAO); Patricia Vidal Hurtado (ILO); Itziar Jauregui (WHO); Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (UNFPA).

Nature of work:

The informal Working Group on Policy Influence and Normative Work is the result of the discussions held in May 2018 at the EPE Session 3.5 – Evaluating Policy Support. It was set up through the joint initiative of its participants to serve as a channel of peer support and experience exchange.

Results achieved:

1. The informal working group on policy influence and normative work was established, and it is functioning as a collaborative peer-support channel where its members find a safe space to share their experiences and questions.
2. Participants' engagement has progressively increased, and the monthly meetings are now counting on high quorums and active participation of members.
3. Participants have shared evaluation reports and useful documents on policy-related theories and methodologies; the group has a shared folder in which it is keeping an updated database of relevant material.
4. Building on the experience of the different UN organizations, the group has identified challenges, good practices and lessons learned that need to be taken into account when evaluating policy influence. The preliminary results of this exercise will be presented at the 2019 UNEG Evaluation Week (EPE 3.7 – Evaluating Policy Support).

Points for discussion at the AGM (if any): The group would like to provide updates on the future areas of work as presented below.

Decision(s) to be taken at the AGM (if any): The informal working group on policy influence would like to continue its activities, and open the membership to colleagues from other UN organizations and external partners.

Financial Reporting

No financial contributions from UNEG funds were requested, nor were direct financial contributions made to WG activities. No in-kind contributions were indicated.

Next steps

Areas for future/ continued work:

The group would like to:

1. Expand its areas of activities to address the demand for policy-related methodologies in the context of UN Reform and SDGs. This would include:
 - a. Rather than exchanging past experiences, the group would serve as a collaborative mechanism of peer support for future evaluations that our organizations are expected to undertake within the contest of the 2030 Agenda. For instance, participants would support each other in evaluability assessments, scoping exercises, validation of methodologies, etc.
 - b. Collaborate with other working groups such as SO2 UNDAF Working Group, SO3 SDG Working Group, and SO3 DAC Evaluation Criteria Task Force.
2. Establish partnerships with actors that are not part of the UN System to discuss innovative methodologies. For instance, the group has plans to reach out to DFID and the Canadian Evaluation Society.
3. Map entry points for developing practical guidance on evaluation of policy and normative support; it could include updating the UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System to expand its content by adding other forms of policy-related work, and to align with UN Reform and SDGs.

Estimated funding requirement/ budget request 2019/2020: N/A