

February 20:
Evaluating the Value Added of UN Work on the Ground
PRESENTATION UNU
Lucien Back

1. UNEG:
 - a. Professional network of Evaluation Offices of UN system
 - b. System-wide – 45 members
 - c. Norms and Standards to serve accountability and learning needs of the system – independence, credibility and usefulness of evaluation function
 - d. Requests for system-wide country-level evaluation work, e.g. Delivering as One and South Africa

2. Evaluation in TCPR 2007
 - a. Recipient countries need to exercise ownership and leadership in the evaluation of all forms of assistance, including that of UN system
 - b. Challenge of evaluation capacity building
 - c. Challenge of evaluation of relevance and effectiveness of operational activities of the UN system to make role and contribution more comprehensive and flexible (including evaluation of UNDAF)
 - d. Assessment of impact on poverty eradication, economic growth and sustainable development
 - e. Evaluation of Delivering as One pilots

3. Evaluation of Delivering as One Pilots
 - a. Request from CEB / HLCP
 - b. Evaluability assessment (2008), process evaluation (2009), results / impact evaluation (2010 / 11)
 - c. Independent, credible and useful assessment against a) expectations of pilot countries themselves and b) benchmarks set by inter-governmental consensus (which was only partly reflected by High-Level Panel Report on System-Wide Coherence)
 - d. No global corporate Delivering as One Programme, but support coordinated by UN-DGO
 - e. Evaluability assessment: definition of parameters for evaluation
 - f. Early assessment of processes and results achieved (especially in countries that started with Joint Offices)
 - g. Parameters for process evaluation:
 - i. National ownership and leadership
 - ii. Relationship with overall UNDAF and work of NRA's: focus vs. inclusiveness
 - iii. The Four One's (One Leader, One Programme, One Budgetary Framework, One Office)
 - h. Substantive parameters

- i. Relevance: Alignment with national policies and strategies, strategic intent (distinctiveness of UN contribution, e.g. normative mandates and relation with IADGs / MDGs), complementarity with other forms of external assistance
 - ii. Effectiveness (logical framework, smartness of objectives and indicators, achievement of results at outcome and impact levels)
 - iii. Efficiency (reduction of transaction cost for national partners and for the UN, feasibility of savings and their channeling into programmes, fewer redundancies, overlaps, gaps and less competition among UN organizations, need for simplification and harmonization at the global level)
 - i. Common parameters for all pilots, but pilots also need to be assessed in their respective national contexts
 - j. Need for pilot countries to share experiences among themselves and with other Member States – lessons learned
 - k. Independent Evaluation requested in TCPR 2007
- 4. Evaluation of role and contribution of the UN system for South Africa
 - a. Joint evaluation at request of South Africa (co-funded, co-managed, mixed team)
 - b. Scoping mission in February 2008 – Evaluation to be completed by end 2008
 - c. Purpose: *Enhance the role and contribution of the UN system in support of RSA policies and strategies for a better South Africa, a better Africa and a better world*
 - d. Objectives: Assess the relevance and effectiveness of
 - i. the contribution of the UN system to *development* in South Africa;
 - ii. the cooperation between the UN system and the RSA related to *humanitarian assistance* in Africa;
 - iii. the cooperation between the UN system and the RSA related to the *environment*
 - iv. the cooperation between the UN system and the RSA related to *peace and security*
 - e. Cross-cutting issues: Capacity development, Gender equity and equality, Human rights, HIV/AIDS
 - f. Need to identify activities / programmes that are evaluable
 - g. Findings may challenge traditional paradigms of cooperation of a middle-income yet “developmental” country with the UN system and shed new light on its “added value”
- 5. Evaluation as an agent of change – UNEG supported evaluations to shed new light on “added value of the UN system on the ground”
 - a. Evaluation needs to be impartial and fully evidence-based - those who commission evaluations and other stakeholders need to respect the integrity of the evaluation function

- b. Need for good preparation of evaluations with clients and stakeholders and good communication throughout the process – management of expectations
- c. Intensive consultation with stakeholders to validate / “triangulate” findings and conclusions and to allow for learning / creating ownership
- d. Participation of clients and stakeholders in generation of recommendations
- e. Importance of after-care (management response, follow-up to accepted recommendations)
- f. Challenge function of impartial and evidence-based evaluation with chances of new insights on “added value of UN system on the ground”.