


Q1 What is your Organization's perspective on UNEG's experience to date of implementing each of the current five evaluation criteria in evaluations (from a cross-institutional, UN system wide perspective)?

Answered: 19 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Not at all positive. Evaluations designed based on the standard evaluation criteria and questions do not entirely meet our expectations and requirements for various reasons, e.g. generic questions are vague and subject to different interpretations; evaluators do not fully address them or address differently; evaluation reports become too structured around the evaluation criteria making them less readable, interesting and compelling; there seems to be an overlap between the criteria of relevance and effectiveness depending on how the questions are formulated. Since these criteria have remained unchanged for a long time and organizations just accepted them as is, there is a need to revisit these criteria in order to meet our needs and requirements.	10/16/2018 4:38 AM
2	While there is scope for refinement and adjustment the [REDACTED] Evaluation Office still considers the DAC criteria very pertinent as they allow evaluators to unpack in a systematic and internationally agreed upon manner the performance and learning elements of a programme. While this unpacking may sometimes overgeneralize matters the rigour the approach provides is a very strong point in favour of maintaining the basic components of the structure and approach. The big challenge of course of this fragmented approach is to make the connections and put the pieces back together in assessing the overall achievement of the programme-- the whole is greater than the sum of its parts dilemma --so to say. OECD DAC criteria as an evaluation approach is a useful mechanism to structure an assessment but it presents a few constraints in practice. The evaluation questions under each criterion tend to narrow the evaluative lens down to the level of an intervention, breaking the system's nature of an intervention by isolating dimensions for analysis. As a consequence, this also limits the capacity of evaluations to cover higher development effectiveness. Consider how the criteria would be applied at increasing more complex levels of attribution and inter-relatedness would be important for the UN and the SDG context. The five criteria as first level criteria or "a principle for evaluating something" captures well the concerns of evaluation across many different context, institutional framework and domains, including within the UN as reflection within the UN Norms and Standard as general overall criteria. Its historical and entrenched nature also suggest that one should clearly built on these and not fundamentally change these.	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
3	[REDACTED] OECD DAC criteria have informed, to different degrees, the design of most OED evaluations, however they are highly contextualized based on the evaluand. The extent of their use also depended on the purpose of the evaluation: evaluations focused more on programmatic improvements, other on management arrangements others on strategic positioning, therefore the application of different criteria will depend on the scope of the evaluation. Furthermore, DAC criteria are good, but their simplistic application leads to their misuse especially when not done by professional evaluators. This is further explained in the answer to qs.2.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
4	Criteria commonly applied in the system is helpful to provide basis for cross-institutional and UN system wide collaboration and perspectives; however, we are not in a position to comment on UNEG's experience on this point.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
5	individual agencies evaluations are not always taking fully account of the UN system level context and too inward looking; in particular relevance and impact criteria are challenging	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
6	They are a cornerstone of the global architecture to evaluate development assistance and have been key to improve accountability and learning.	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
7	The five criteria are very minimal	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
8	Overall good. however: Relevance has been trivialized to some extent. (e.g. all seems to be relevant to all nowadays) Efficiency is superficial, as normally we don't have references or benchmarks to compare with. and not much attention is put on the quantitative side of efficiency Effectiveness, is being used sometimes as too generic criteria, mixing up different results levels (impact, outcome, output) then creating a confusing judgment Sustainability, needs still more attention and unpacking the factors behind (ownership, replication, scale-up) Impact: normally ignored or trivialized to anecdotal impact but not to systematic/broader IMPACT	10/11/2018 8:10 AM

OECD/DAC Criteria Consultation Process

9	<p>The Norms and Standards for Evaluation have become a key framework for the conceptualization, conduct and quality assessment of evaluations in UN agencies and beyond. In this sense, the contribution of UNEG to enhance the quality of the evaluation functions and especially of evaluations, is to be recognized. As part of this effort, use of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria has become standard among UN agencies. Having said this, UNEG seems to have put great emphasis on the 'relevance', 'effectiveness' and – to a lesser extent – 'sustainability' criteria. 'Efficiency' and 'impact' seem not to have been used or promoted by UNEG member agencies to the same degree. Our suggestion would be to stress the importance of embedding efficiency and impact criteria in UNEG evaluations, and to review the ways sustainability is interpreted and used. While the DAC criteria are widely used by UNEG and its members, the integration of gender, human rights and equity dimensions seems to be an overall weakness. We are of the belief that in order to make more progress in doing evaluations with an equity, HR and gender lens, we would need a standalone criterion. UNEG could greatly contribute in the future by putting together guidelines or technical notes aimed at spelling out how the criteria could be applied to UNEG work.</p>	10/11/2018 12:08 AM
10	<p>We have fudged our use of the criteria of effectiveness, impact and sustainability; precision only on the relevance criterion and shied away from the efficiency</p>	10/10/2018 11:09 PM
11	<p>The UNEG frameworks and guidelines based on the OECD/DAC criteria have been useful as a start point to guide the evaluation work at the UN System. Some efforts have been made to adapt these criteria to particular areas, like the guidance for normative work or the guidance for integration of human rights and gender.</p>	10/10/2018 4:22 PM
12	<p>Not sure we really understand the question – it doesn't feel possible to aggregate an agency's unified view on UNEG's experience of implementing each of the 5 criteria. Thus, we'd propose instead asking for more specific feedback of individual agency experience of using the criteria – possibly by asking them to map the frequency each of the criteria have been 'used' in the last five years and then provide an assessment of useful this was. This more granular approach may be more beneficial in trying to assess level of uptake, and assessing which criteria have proven most useful, and why.</p>	10/10/2018 1:34 PM
13	<p>The evaluation criteria have helped harmonized evaluation practices across UN agencies and facilitated the recognition of evaluation profession in the UN system and among all development agencies. However, we acknowledge that, over the years, the interpretation of the criteria has evolved significantly from the original definitions and have been adjusted to specific context of each Agency, as applicable. As such adaptations are proliferating, which is not a negative aspect. However, it is indeed timely to re-look at the original definitions and update them to reflect how the criteria are used in the current and future development context.</p>	10/10/2018 11:21 AM
14	<p>The recent mid-term review of the current UNEG strategy used the 5 criteria to conduct its analysis. These criteria were complemented with theory based approach. Beyond this specifics, the use of the 5 criteria enables coherence in evaluation functions and within the evaluation profession within UN system, and beyond.</p>	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
15	<p>N/A We are not a UN organization</p>	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
16	<p>Uniformity in the conduct of the analysis and in the determination of the evaluation scope, with a limited number of comprehensive and relatively well defined criteria is one of the most interesting aspect around the use of OECD/DAC criteria.</p>	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
17	<p>Long experience more than 12 years</p>	10/5/2018 5:46 PM
18	<p> The responses below are provided from the sole perspective</p>	10/5/2018 11:38 AM
19	<p>The OECD/DAC criteria are not used explicitly in our evaluation, they serve as a conceptual framework rather than a unit of analysis</p>	10/4/2018 12:23 PM

Q2 What are your Organization's views on the adequacy of each of the current evaluation criteria to capture key concerns and issues relevant to the work of the UN system, as expressed in UN norms and standards?

Answered: 19 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The current evaluation criteria does not fully capture the assessment of results at the outcome level which is a priority for my organization. To address this, we have used to include a specific question on results achieved either under relevance or effectiveness with some success but since this question is embedded under relevance or effective it does not show prominently in the evaluation report. Recently, we are introducing a separate evaluation criteria for results (in lieu of impact criteria) to highlight outcome level results and hoping that this will do the tricks.	10/16/2018 4:38 AM
2	The two criteria that can most use "retooling" and also have good potential in the context of the SDGs are relevance and efficiency as the first one has great potential in the context of the SDGs while the latter one has generally been weak in most evaluations. Efficiency is often seen as "value for money" which raises issues of what is good value and how to value outcomes/results in a consistent manner and be able to provide data and carry out analysis of efficiency. In multi-stakeholder and multi-level evaluations such as what the SDGs will call for will accentuate these. Emphasizing that efficiency is not only a value for money but how the implementation process is optimum in terms of quality and quantity of resources used and applied and where resources are the full range of financial and other forms of resources such also knowledge, skills, procedures, tools, institutional mechanisms etc. It would be important to Include issues that reflects responsive implementation as part of efficiency such as adaptability to changing circumstances, use of mitigating strategies, agility of implementation etc.	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
3	[REDACTED] The criteria remain overall valid, as an overarching framework, however their application cannot be done in a simplistic linear way (e.g. baseline + project – control = effectiveness). However, their application needs to consider the complexity surrounding development interventions, and that any project/program is implemented in a changing environment. The linear 'logframe' approach relegates most of this complexity to the risk and assumptions sections, thereby writing off most of the important factors affecting the intended outcomes of the interventions. Theory based approaches are better suited to interpret and apply the criteria in a way that produces more useful information, for example, theory of change based evaluations are better at taking into account complexity and identifying the contributions of the project/programme to the development objectives.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
4	Utility and consultation with key stakeholders are clearly defined in the UNEG standards to prepare Evaluation Plan and this is practiced routinely at the organization's level; however, we are not presently in a position to comment on the evaluation criteria to capture key concerns and issues relevant to the work at the UN system-wide level.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
5	Relevance needs to be put into perspective of the broader context, i.e.. relevance compared to what others are doing in a specific field, in consideration of scale; Impact measurement is often challenging due to lack of impact level indicators and limited resources for impact assessment ;	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
6	After many decades of use, the evaluation OECD DAC evaluation criteria need some update.	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
7	they are adequate, but not enough.	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
8	They are ok, but not anymore covering the other dimension needed for the learning and improvement value of evaluations (e.g Theory of Change elements)	10/11/2018 8:10 AM

OECD/DAC Criteria Consultation Process

9	<p>██████████ the OECD/DAC criteria are largely adequate to capture key concerns of UN work. This is because they are broad enough to be re-interpreted in ways that make sense in a changed aid environment (2030 Agenda). For example, while the criteria were established with project/programme work and least developed countries in mind, they can be (and have been) redefined in terms of the policy/advocacy work the UN family engages in in middle income countries and beyond. There are two notable exceptions where the current criteria are not considered adequate: humanitarian action and capturing human rights/gender dimensions. The additional criteria routinely used in evaluations of humanitarian action – connectedness, coherence and coverage – now have a bearing on most ██████████ evaluations. This is because humanitarian and development work is increasingly integrated in the agency (the “nexus”) and evaluations have to capture results across the humanitarian-development continuum. ██████████ it would be useful to embed the humanitarian evaluation criteria (or a condensed version thereof) in the DAC criteria rather than having separate sets. The UNEG Norms and Standards are clear regarding the central place they give to gender equality and human rights. ██████████ it is the explicit rights-based approach sets the UN family apart from other bilateral and multilateral actors. Therefore, it would be worthwhile considering a separate criterion for gender/rights/equity. While rights concerns have been and can be folded under the existing criteria (e.g. Effectiveness for which groups? Empowering/participatory processes through which results were achieved?) it would be helpful to emphasise these elements for the UNEG community through an evaluation criterion in its own right.</p>	10/11/2018 12:08 AM
10	Equality issue has been poorly covered by criteria	10/10/2018 11:09 PM
11	In normative work it's difficult to assess the impact of an intervention, as it usually takes a long time to see the results of the implementation of legislation of policy. The same happens sometimes with the Sustainability criterion.	10/10/2018 4:22 PM
12	We recognise the ‘dominance’ of the effectiveness criteria, which may be contributing to a lack of systematic analysis in areas that are equally relevant going forward e.g. coherence and connectedness in relation to humanitarian-development, as well as in other emerging areas where deeper analysis of links between cause and effect would be beneficial beyond more traditional application of the ‘effectiveness’ criteria e.g. climate change, SDGs. We also recognise there is divided opinion on whether it is better to allow for more flexible and nuanced definition of the criteria based on specific evaluation scope and questions versus greater clarity on definitions so as to ensure common understanding and consistency in application and interpretation. Also, key questions to consider going forward – do the current criteria and their de facto definitions promote or constrain the ability of evaluators to measure contribution/attribution; direct/indirect results etc. which are becoming increasing key considerations when assessing the potential value add of the UN system when working with national governments, private sector etc.	10/10/2018 1:34 PM
13	The five criteria provide a good foundation to assess the value of various development interventions, but they are not adequate to address emerging value dimensions such as gender, innovation, replication and scaling up, environment/climate change, human rights, partnership. These emerging criteria, in fact, have been introduced and used in some UN agencies, but are not yet incorporated into the main evaluation criteria in a comprehensive manner. Among the five 'traditional' criteria, efficiency is proven to be challenging in terms of applying consistent and rigorous evaluation methodologies. ██████████ we have collaborated with our internal auditors when conducting country-level evaluation. Relevant audit tools have been effectively used.	10/10/2018 11:21 AM
14	The 5 criteria are adequate analytical tools to assess an intervention. They can be used in combination with cross-cutting issues that specifically focus on key concerns and issues relevant to the work of the UN system, such as for HR&GE.	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
15	N/A We are not a UN organization	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
16	The criteria are limited in number and relevant. However they should remove references to development intervention and to programme as they can cover other evaluation fields (policy, humanitarian). In revising them, they should also avoid duplication or overlapping of definitions with the ALNAP criteria for humanitarian evaluation.	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
17	Criteria are somewhat limited to capture reality and the new evaluation approaches, developmental, gender, complexity sensitive	10/5/2018 5:46 PM
18	The ██████████ institutional framework for the evaluation work is different from the UN's, which means that certain parts of the UN norms and standards may not be applicable. The ██████████ experience so far is that the current evaluation criteria are fairly adequate. They helped structure our evaluation work and gave it a higher standing in an organization which has a weak evaluation culture.	10/5/2018 11:38 AM

OECD/DAC Criteria Consultation Process

19	The DAC criteria are not in themselves operational parameters, concepts such as 'impact' or 'relevance' clearly need further explicated within the context of a particular programme – external intervention - to usefully structure an evaluation e.g. relevance to whom? in the context of what policy? impact on what? and so forth	10/4/2018 12:23 PM
----	--	--------------------

Q3 What are your Organization's views on the adequacy of each of the current evaluation criteria for joint collaborative, system-wide evaluation and considering the broad scope of work in the UN system by the various agencies?

Answered: 19 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	No comments. We do not do this type of evaluation	10/16/2018 4:38 AM
2	As cooperation and synergy become more important as part of a One UN approach in addressing SDG challenges the 3 Cs of coherence, complementarity and coordination become more important. Key to joint, collaborative evaluations is common understanding and agreement on application the criteria. This is again where contextualized, domain specific further definition, sub-criteria and specific evaluations questions are important. Much of UNEG work around the norms and standards, which would form the basis for UN system wide evaluation is based on the criteria which serves as the starting point and which the evaluands often understand sufficiently well to agree on these.	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
3	Joint, collaborative and system wide organizations are challenging for a number of reasons. The different interpretation of the OECD DAC criteria can be an added challenge, however it is not the main one. Other things like the differences in mandates, governing structures, programmatic cycles and approaches, and administrative processes are a greater hindrance. However, a more common understanding of the need for contextualizing the criteria can help evaluation manager of joint evaluations in better tailoring their methodologies.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
4	We have not had experience in joint evaluation with other UN institutions. Considering the diversity of the types of activities conducted by different UN institutions, we are of the view that such evaluation criteria should be defined sufficiently at a higher level and allowed flexible application.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
5	the criteria of inclusion, system coherence, and coverage and outreach are not sufficiently visible although they can be somehow covered under relevance ; system coherence and collaboration can also be covered under effectiveness but should become more visible as a criteria; coverage is increasingly important to ensure reaching the unreached under the SDG agenda	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
6	A standardized approach allows for meta-analysis and aggregation. Their broad applicability across sectors is a plus.	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
7	Again, they are very minimal	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
8	Cant assess this, as we have no (or very little) cases of joint evaluations.	10/11/2018 8:10 AM
9	Joint evaluations, collaborative evaluations and system-wide evaluations are still a small part of work. An important aspect of those evaluations is coordination/synergies between actors. This is sometimes treated as an aspect of 'efficiency', but sometimes given one or several criteria of their own such as connectedness or coherence (borrowing from humanitarian evaluations). As noted above, the traditional OECD/DAC criteria are largely adequate if appropriately redefined. This holds true for joint work as well.	10/11/2018 12:08 AM
10	Current criteria are framed by 'project' level understanding and intervention; do not yield so easily to broader policy level cohesion	10/10/2018 11:09 PM
11	With so many agencies working in different areas, it is difficult to have criteria that can be used with the same emphasis and rigorousness in any area of work. In any case, cluster evaluations could be considered, using specific criteria for each particular area.	10/10/2018 4:22 PM
12	We generally feel they are 'adequate' in this regard, but would also refer to our response to the question above – do we rely too heavily on one or two of the existing criteria to try and understand/explain out results; do they help us really unpack and understand what it is most important to measure given the evolving way in which we work?	10/10/2018 1:34 PM

OECD/DAC Criteria Consultation Process

13	As mentioned above, the five criteria and emerging criteria have been interpreted differently by different Agencies, with some emerging criteria not yet universally adopted across the UN system. While the five criteria have often been used at a high level to facilitate joint evaluations, some degrees of different interpretations and emphasis on other criteria by different organizations hindered some joint efforts.	10/10/2018 11:21 AM
14	The 5 criteria are adequate in terms of enabling joint collaborative work between UN evaluation functions. As explained above, cross-cutting dimensions should be systematically examined within each of the evaluation criteria, when applicable. Depending on the purpose of the evaluation and characteristics of the object under evaluation, not all criteria and cross-cutting dimensions are always used to formulate evaluation questions.	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
15	N/A We are not a UN organization	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
16	As mentioned under Q2, the definition should not be limited as also appropriate for system-wide evaluations for instance.	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
17	Divergent from reality	10/5/2018 5:46 PM
18	No opinion as we are not part of the UN system.	10/5/2018 11:38 AM
19	For joint and system-wide evaluations the DAC criteria can be easily mapped across a log-frame or a set of predetermined outcomes (implicit linear causality), however, the criteria can make the findings more presentable and universally understood	10/4/2018 12:23 PM

Q4 What are your Organization's views on the adequacy of the definitions for each of the five criteria?

Answered: 19 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	As mentioned above.	10/16/2018 4:38 AM
2	There is a need to review the clarity and scope of some of the definition – e.g. “Sustain the benefits of intervention” be incorrectly interpreted as continuing the intervention rather than building on the changed situation as result of intervention. Impact perhaps also needs to be clearer in its focus ultimate change for stakeholders and beneficiaries. And clearly what do the definition of the criteria and associated questions look like with a SDG lens? A recommendation with proposals for clearly understood questions on what each criteria means – translating it into stakeholder relevant questions. Contextualizing criteria would help in identifying such questions. It could also be considered to encourage/suggest institutional or domain specific definitions within criteria and sub-criteria to make these more relevant and contextualized. For instance, with normative work and international standards – what does effectiveness in a norm or standards context mean? Some domains do have some form of specific interpretation of the criteria, such as the UN Norms and Standards so elaborating any revision to the criteria within UNEG Norms and Standards would be key. Contextualized and domain specific version or elaboration of the criteria is key to the use or application of the criteria and experience and recommendations should come from these contextualization. Any suggestions on use/application coming out of the OECD/DAC criteria process should focus on the overall suggestions to elaborate these rather than contain any detailed guidelines on these.	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
3	As per question 2, the criteria can work as they are, with the broader caveat that as UNEG members we should shift away from simple linear approaches and methodologies. The criteria as they are, give a false sense of comparability. In reality development interventions vary broadly and are difficult to compare. The criteria are also very economics-focused (especially efficiency). However, having universal criteria has the value of setting a common standard, and speaks to the same criteria used for project design. Some countries (e.g. Mexico) have developed nationally recognized criteria and standards for evaluations, against which all public sector projects/programs need to be assessed. This should be encouraged as it ensures that evaluations reflect the principles of the national stakeholders.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
4	We have not had experience in joint evaluation with other UN institutions. Considering the diversity of the types of activities conducted by different UN institutions, we are of the view that such evaluation criteria should be defined sufficiently at a higher level and allowed flexible application.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
5	definitions are too narrow and would require update within the perspective of the SDG agenda UN system wide approaches, and country led evaluation perspectives	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
6	The evaluation criteria should continue orienting the evaluation practice and I would not question the importance of keeping them	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
7	Relevance definition should be broaden. The same applies for sustainability.	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
8	See answer to 1	10/11/2018 8:10 AM
9	Evaluation Office view of the adequacy of the definitions for each of the five criteria is that they are ambiguous and thus susceptible to different interpretations. For instance, the definition of relevance does not adequately address all the aspects of relevance making it hard to understand what attributes to apply (e.g. relevance to what/who? Is responsiveness/agility part of relevance? Should the 'added-value' of a policy or programme be analyzed as part of the relevance criterion? Etc.). In the efficiency analysis, what kind of costs should be factored in, and should evaluations look at other types of inputs beyond financial ones? The difference between effectiveness and impact is not well understood and should be clarified. Under effectiveness, the quality of outputs and outcomes is rarely assessed and should be further emphasized. With regard to sustainability, the distinction between sustainability of past achievements/results and the likelihood of sustainability in future is unclear, and there is insufficient attention given to the analysis of the various sustainability dimensions and underlying factors. There is sometimes confusion between impact and sustainability, and between sustainability and scalability. Our view is that the current (and any new) criteria should be unpacked, their definitions refined (and wherever possible contextualized for clearer broader applications), and accompanied with examples of analytical frameworks, areas of inquiry and evaluation questions.	10/11/2018 12:08 AM

OECD/DAC Criteria Consultation Process

10	See above	10/10/2018 11:09 PM
11	The definitions are based on development interventions, which not necessarily have the same characteristics as interventions in other areas, like humanitarian or normative work.	10/10/2018 4:22 PM
12	Also see response to question 2. In addition, it would be beneficial from our agency perspective, to see more consideration of how more recent developments such as the 'centrality of protection' and humanitarian principles could be more systematically reflected in the applied definitions. It may be useful to consider providing case study examples of how the criteria have been applied in addition to the existing definitions.	10/10/2018 1:34 PM
13	The original definitions are no longer adequate (or current) as some of them (e.g. relevance and efficiency) were based on the perspectives of 'donors,' rendering wordings such as 'aid activity' or 'beneficiaries' rather obsolete. Efficiency, in particular, is based on the cost effectiveness of the donors, not the countries. Efficiency should also go beyond the consideration of inputs and outputs alone.	10/10/2018 11:21 AM
14	Broadly, definitions are adequate. Let us see what the changes are proposed by OECD-DAC, if any.	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
15	<p>Relevance OECD/DAC: The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. Relevance [REDACTED] The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the [REDACTED] is dedicated; this analysis includes an assessment of changes in relevance over time. -> We refer relevance to local, national and global environmental priorities rather than referring to target groups, recipients and donors. We find our definition more appropriate than the OECD-DAC one for these two reasons: (i) what would be the difference between target groups and recipients? (ii) Why Donors' priorities rather than global 'uncontested' priorities? Effectiveness OECD/DAC: A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives. Effectiveness [REDACTED] The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved. -> We also focus on the likelihood that the objectives will be achieved. We find this more in tune with the current push we evaluators receive from decision makers to produce more and more real-time evaluative evidence, often before activities have even started on the ground. Efficiency OECD/DAC: Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted. Efficiency [REDACTED] The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. -> We like the OECD-DAC definition of efficiency more as it is more comprehensive than ours. The [REDACTED] definition refers only to cost resources, but in our evaluations we consider time as well, as for example the many project cycle timeline analyses we provide in several of our evaluations. Impact OECD/DAC: The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions. Impact [REDACTED] -> Results—in [REDACTED] terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects. -> When it comes to impact we have a rather different definitions. We more broadly refer to results, which include outputs, outcomes and impacts. Importantly, we explicitly refer to progress to impact (and implicitly to intermediate states), which is good and should be maintained. But we miss the positive and negative, the unintended and intended, and the activity-related and context-related dimensions of traditional impact analysis, which we should bring into our definition. Sustainability OECD/DAC: Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable. Sustainability [REDACTED] The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable. -> Both OECD-DAC [REDACTED] definitions of sustainability lack the institutional and political dimensions, which should accompany the cited financial, environmental and social ones. [REDACTED] we look at four sustainability dimensions: financial, institutional, political and environmental.</p>	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
16	As mentioned under Q2 reference to development and programme should be removed. Only a problem in the delimitation between efficiency and effectiveness: definitions are clear but their use sometimes inappropriate. We should also consider that the use of the impact criteria is more often related to 'expected impact' rather than 'measured impact', for which we often refer to impact evaluation.	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
17	The definitions are good enough	10/5/2018 5:46 PM

OECD/DAC Criteria Consultation Process

18	The definition of the Effectiveness and Efficiency criteria should better take into consideration some of the principles of the Accra Agenda for Action, and in particular inclusive partnerships.	10/5/2018 11:38 AM
19	a majority of evaluation users and donors expect to see the DAC criteria in the evaluation ToRs and reports but we use mainly theory-based designs and we don't mechanically apply the DAC criteria	10/4/2018 12:23 PM

Q5 Do you have any suggestions for adaptation of the five criteria from a UNEG/system wide perspective?

Answered: 18 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Yes, as provided above	10/16/2018 4:38 AM
2	OECD DAC criteria (and related evaluation questions) could be revisited to capture elements from other evaluation approaches (e.g., Program theory). Additional specific criteria and questions could be also revisited to focus particularly on matters related to the broad scope of work in the UN system by the various agencies (UN-system wide perspective) and current sustainable development frameworks. Adaptation relevant for UN system would need to consider the need for the criteria to be based on sufficient commonalities in the evaluations at various levels so that these can address national issues through the country-led evaluations (at national, sub-national and sectoral level), UN country issues related to the UN system as a development partners (individual partnership issues); complementary partnerships issues at country level; UN system wide issues and other partnerships issues at global level – ideally as linked and/or as part of the same evaluation process so that the contributions, inter-relatedness, coherence, complementarity etc. can be covered. In many ways this would reinforce the important function and universality of the criteria.	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
3	██████████ No proposals for changes, but there is need for returning to their initial intention of being guiding principles. Also a broader discussion on interpretation and contextualization is needed within UNEG as it relates also to evaluation methods used. Instead of criteria, they can be called 'dimensions'. This term is more conducive to a broader interpretation, and less prescriptive. They should not serve as benchmarking 'criteria' but rather provide a guiding framework, therefore a term like 'dimension' or 'principles' is more appropriate.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
4	We have no comment to offer on this point.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
5	system coherence, outreach/partnerships, coverage/inclusion, communication, as well as gender equality could be separate criteria to gain on visibility, relevance requires consideration within the broader context (see above)	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
6	The definition of relevance needs to include the dimension of the appropriateness/quality of design. Efficiency is too broad and needs proxy indicators.	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
7	Need to add criteria such to better capture environment and equity.	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
8	Some other implicit criteria is needed to be made explicit, such as: partnerships, convening roles, pathway to impact, preconditions, replication, scale-up	10/11/2018 8:10 AM
9	██████████ it would be useful to embed the humanitarian evaluation criteria (in particular connectedness/coherence) in the DAC criteria to capture coordination and synergies between actors. Some practical suggestions include: i) Develop an evaluation framework for UNEG/system wide evaluations ii) Work on the formulation of key evaluation questions that can be used as guiding questions for UNEG/system wide evaluations; iii) Contextualize the criteria: elaborate on what each criteria means when it comes to be used in system wide/UNEG evaluations. iv) Invest in knowledge management: webinars to discuss the topic, exchange of experience, documentation of lessons, etc.	10/11/2018 12:08 AM
10	Orientation to impact, for example, could be used as alternative to the Impact criterion. Sometimes, it is impossible to assess the impact of an intervention, but it is possible to assess if the strategic approach is oriented to the achievement of impact in the long term.	10/10/2018 4:22 PM
11	Also see response to question 4. Again, recognising there is no clear consensus in response to this question at present, we would propose developing a conceptual framework that helps ties the five criteria together from a more systems/understanding complexity perspective – another reason why case studies to elaborate on definitions may be useful. We would also propose more explicit connection to the principles and value-base underpinning evaluation work in the definitions.	10/10/2018 1:34 PM
12	To make the interpretation of the criteria more updated to the current context (e.g. achieving the SDGs), and take into consideration the cross-cutting criteria such as gender, innovation, human rights, climate change, with a view to better representing the overall value of the interventions being evaluated.	10/10/2018 11:21 AM

OECD/DAC Criteria Consultation Process

13	More than adapting the 5 criteria themselves, it is their implementation by evaluators that needs to be improved - with common sense not in a ticking box manner - as too often observed. Utility of evaluation is crucial.	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
14	More broadly, the international evaluation community is questioning whether relevance analysis is indeed relevant to our evaluative work, because most evaluations conclude with positive assessments of relevance. Our experience [REDACTED] is not so uniform. We often found in our evaluations that [REDACTED] support has had weak relevance to national environmental priorities, as in the case of insufficient land degradation support in Sub-Saharan Africa.	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
15	No except with the change proposed under Q2 and 4.	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
16	New criteria must be designed and established in agreement with UN sister agencies	10/5/2018 5:46 PM
17	No	10/5/2018 11:38 AM
18	NO. we shouldn't adopt the DAC criteria for any evaluation, we can define a common set of questions that look at the strategic relevance and contribution to results. DAC criteria should be used as a conceptual framework to define evaluation questions and sub-questions.	10/4/2018 12:23 PM

Q6 Are there any key themes/areas of Agenda 2030, which the group feel, are not captured by the current criteria?

Answered: 18 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	No comments	10/16/2018 4:38 AM
2	The definition of the criteria and associated questions should be reviewed and adjusted with a SDG lens. A strong case should be made if there is to be suggestions on any additional criteria related to SDGs as the current criteria or headings of criteria are universally covering and could cover this with the sub-criteria, definitions and possible evaluation questions that incorporate SDGs.	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
3	Possibly the theme of equity, which is present in several SDGs.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
4	We have no comment to offer on this point at this time.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
5	inclusion, gender equality ; system coherence (including with the national development landscape beyond the UN); CRE (cultural responsiveness of the interventions)	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
6	The SDGs demand to reach out to marginalized groups of population in order to eradicate poverty, end hunger and spread prosperity. Based on experience, identifying more clearly the target population and their differentiated needs, improves the soundness of the interventions.	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
7	Innovations and climate change.	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
8	See answers in question 5	10/11/2018 8:10 AM
9	Most SDG are about universal access to basic and sustainable services. This involves taking current efforts and results to scale, leaving no one behind, and paying greater attention to sustainability in policies and programming. Sustainability is already included in the current OECD-DAC criteria. The criterion of "scaling up / scalability" could be added. When examined, equity (along with gender equality and human rights) is often – and poorly – addressed under other evaluation criteria. Making it a stand-alone evaluation criterion would allow for a more systematic, comprehensive and robust analysis of equity. It is widely acknowledged that the various SDGs are interlinked, complementary and synergetic. Significant and lasting results in some areas need to be supported or are conditioned by progress in others. Moreover, significant and lasting progress is conditioned by the ability to prevent humanitarian crises, respond to them when they occur and build resilience. This requires advances in inter-sectoral coordination and integrated programming; stronger connectivity between development and humanitarian action and actors; better alignment between policies and systems on the one hand and service delivery on the other; and collaborative, multi-stakeholder approaches and partnerships. This aspects can form the components of a new criterion for development evaluations, which could be named "coherence" or "connectedness" (as a reference to the ALNAP evaluation criteria for evaluation of humanitarian action): coherence/connectedness with other sectors; with other actors and initiatives; and between development and humanitarian action. Evaluators and evaluation managers should be encouraged to be more selective in their choice of evaluation criteria, retaining those that are the most relevant and useful to their specific evaluation context and needs. Moreover, they should be encouraged to contextualize and adapt them as needed.	10/11/2018 12:08 AM
10	Inclusion, gender, equality or peace, for example, are areas that could be better captured.	10/10/2018 4:22 PM
11	More explicit focus on how to apply in the context of 'Leave No One Behind' and the Humanitarian-Development Nexus.	10/10/2018 1:34 PM
12	Gender, innovation, climate change, partnership	10/10/2018 11:21 AM
13	Cross-cutting issues on environment, poverty, etc. could be developed for supporting evaluators on SDG-related themes, just as UNEG did already for HR&GE.	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
14	N/A We do not depart from Agenda 2030.	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
15	Nothing coming to mind, the criteria being adapted to multiple scenarios and approaches.	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
16	Many of them primarily SDG 16 and other similar SDGS with a holistic reach.	10/5/2018 5:46 PM
17	As suggested under Q3 above, SDG 17 on Partnerships for the Goals may not be explicitly captured by the current criteria.	10/5/2018 11:38 AM

18	the SDGs are based on results (development change) the current criteria dont facilitate measurement of development change. only evaluation questions provide in-depth insights on how things progress and what triggers change and how	10/4/2018 12:23 PM
----	--	--------------------

Q7 Do you have any suggestions for additional or replacement criteria going forward?

Answered: 19 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	As provided above.	10/16/2018 4:38 AM
2	One could consider developing sub-criteria within these criteria to capture the dimensions of the criteria. For instance for relevance – Coherence, Complementarily, Coordination – could be added; for effectiveness and impact for instance Equality and “Leaving no one behind”. Use of evaluation approaches (e.g. program theory etc.) should be linked to any criteria so one suggestion or recommendation is for a review and documentation of how the criteria apply to the different evaluation approaches and suggestions on how to optimize the use of these. The criteria are used at the time of evaluations and says perhaps little on how it applies to and could be incorporated into the design stage, for instance as part of ex-ante appraisal. E.g. is the relevance, impact and expected sustainability sufficiently defined at the design stage? Should there (sub)-definitions and questions that focus on this?	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
3	██████████ No.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
4	We have no suggestion to offer at this time.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
5	see above, already mentioned	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
6	Adding coverage would allow to respond to the political economy question. It has the advantage of universal application.	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
7	Innovation, climate change, gender and equity	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
8	see answers 5 and 6	10/11/2018 8:10 AM
9	Most of our suggestions are embedded in our answers above. To summarize we suggest to: i) Include equity/human rights/gender as a standalone criterion ii) Consider incorporating ‘connectedness’/‘coherence’ as a standalone criterion iii) Consider incorporating ‘scalability’ as a standalone criterion All five original criteria should be kept but redefined, e.g.: iv) Link effectiveness to human rights (participation, inclusiveness, empowerment) v) Including added value, responsiveness/agility under relevance See our answer to question 4 for more pointers.	10/11/2018 12:08 AM
10	Add: 1. Contribution to Equality, Observance of Transparency	10/10/2018 11:09 PM
11	Human Rights and Gender Equality could be considered among the evaluation criteria, not just as a cross-cutting issue, but as an additional stand-alone criteria to be assessed in each intervention.	10/10/2018 4:22 PM
12	Some consensus on possible additional criteria which more explicitly reflect on accountability, inclusion, equity, participation and empowerment. We would also recommend guidance on how to interpret the existing criteria in more forward-looking and progressive ways.	10/10/2018 1:34 PM
13	As mentioned in question 6 but it is not only about adding more criteria but also incorporating cross-cutting themes into the existing criteria.	10/10/2018 11:21 AM
14	It is not an issue of “additional” or “replaced” evaluation criteria, it is about using these valid criteria within the context of the theory of change of the object under evaluation.	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
15	No comments.	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
16	As mentioned under Q2, important to avoid two sources of criteria, for instance ALNAP and OECD/DAC, as well as extending beyond development.	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
17	Sistemic: the ability of the intervention to tackle complex problems with a degree or sense of progress.	10/5/2018 5:46 PM
18	No	10/5/2018 11:38 AM
19	What is required is to contextualize the concepts and prioritize. instead of asking the evaluators to assess the effectiveness in general, one must ask for instance whether a national system has the capacity, tools and means to support youth employment, rather than asking what the UN have done to support youth	10/4/2018 12:23 PM

Q8 Do you have any other comment you would like to provide?

Answered: 15 Skipped: 4

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The process of revisiting the OECD/DAC criteria and extensive consultation process should perhaps lead to these no longer being the "OECD/DAC" criteria but the criteria for "development evaluation", "public accountable evaluation" or whatever term captures the fact that the criteria can and should be use when evaluating both development, development cooperation/assistance, external funding, national funded programmes etc. This is particularly important in the context of SDGs interrelated nature, country driven process etc. but also when considering the importance of "non-ODA" such as private financial flows, national and local funding, policies in domains such as trade, foreign investment, public private partnerships etc. as part of policy coherence approach. A key focus of the criteria and any guidance in using them should be on building capacity on the evaluation criteria and advocating how these – with the revised definitions, sub-criteria and associated model questions – can be used by national partners as part of the national sustainable development process. Any criteria for "development evaluation" has to be sufficient universally applied across countries, partnerships and institutional settings to allow evaluations to say something about the whole development process. It is in many ways the basis of the criteria that they have to a large extent allowed this but with any revision, adaptation there is change to reinforce these, particularly by taking these out of the notion of "DAC/OECD" (=donors, development partner) context.	10/15/2018 5:57 PM
2	██████████ DAC criteria are easy to adopt and offer a simple solution for evaluators, especially those who carry out commissioned evaluations. However, evaluation offices, which generally have more capacity, should encourage more complex approaches. Based on the revised criteria by OECD, as a draft in Dec 2018, and then as final in May 2019, UNEG can consider holding a dedicated discussion on this at the Eval Week 2019.	10/15/2018 3:26 PM
3	Nothing in particular.	10/15/2018 1:00 PM
4	rethinking and redefining the criteria will help making evaluation findings and recommendations more relevant and useful/usable in the SDG context	10/12/2018 1:21 PM
5	Coverage would address who benefited from the initiatives and who did not, and can be asked in every sector, according to the initiatives' objectives.	10/11/2018 12:32 PM
6	No	10/11/2018 12:19 PM
7	Evaluators and evaluation managers should be encouraged to be more selective in their choice of evaluation criteria, retaining those that are the most relevant and useful to their specific evaluation context and needs. Moreover, they should be encouraged to contextualize and adapt them as needed. UNEG entities should invest more on professional training and knowledge management for evaluations.	10/11/2018 12:08 AM
8	In addition to the perspective by IEG (C. Heider) in her blog (link) on revisiting the DAC criteria, the recent ACF annual learning review offers some useful insights for consideration https://www.actionagainsthunger.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/learningreview_2017.pdf	10/10/2018 1:34 PM
9	Like many other agencies in the UN system, we look up to the UNEG mechanism for methodological advice and exchanging good practices. UNEG guidance, in particular, has served as our advocacy tool to promote evaluation culture within the organization. Updating definitions of the existing evaluation criteria and including new ones will greatly help us in these efforts (it is difficult to refer to practices of other specific Agencies as this causes pushbacks from evaluation stakeholders). Instead of being OECD/DAC criteria/definitions, there should be UNEG (with OECD/DAC) criteria/definitions.	10/10/2018 11:21 AM
10	Caution in UNEG embarking itself into changing or replacing the 5 criteria. Emphasis should be more on encouraging their adequate use.	10/10/2018 9:58 AM
11	No comments.	10/9/2018 9:43 PM
12	No .	10/8/2018 3:48 PM
13	Let's do this quickly !! Before it is too late	10/5/2018 5:46 PM
14	No	10/5/2018 11:38 AM
15	The use of evaluation questions as the driver of the evaluation methodology does not imply discarding the widely-recognized OECD DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance, it rather utilizes the DAC criteria as a framing approach rather than operational framework.	10/4/2018 12:23 PM

4	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]