

UNFPA Response to the UNEG-OECD/DAC Peer Review of the UNFPA Evaluation Function

Peer Review Report Issue Date [May 31, 2023]	<u>Evaluation report tag</u> [choose 1 from the list below]: 1. Programme Level Evaluation (non CPE or RPE evaluations)	<u>Additional attributes</u> [joint, impact or institutional]	UNFPA Business Units Responsible for implementation [list all]	Heads of Responsible Business Units Final approvers	Responsible Unit Managing/Coordinating Focal Point [name and email address]	Date of submission

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 1	<p>Recommendation 1. The job classification and job descriptions of Evaluation Advisers in headquarters and regional offices, as well as of country level M&E staff, should be revisited.</p> <p>(a) As practiced in other UN agencies, UNFPA should consider re-competing non-rotational positions at the end of the standard tour of duty (5 years in HQ), with the incumbent eligible for renewal once for the same position. Rotation within the monitoring & evaluation (M&E) job group (Headquarters/Regional Offices) should be encouraged together with other mobility modalities, for example, inter-agency loans, towards strengthening staff learning, career pathways and behavioral independence.</p> <p>(b) Reporting lines within the regional offices and country offices should be revised. Regional M&E Advisers should report directly to the Regional Director on evaluation matters, with a secondary (dotted) reporting line to the Evaluation Office.</p> <p>(c) Country Office M&E officers/focal points should report directly to the Representative and possess at least basic evaluation competencies (i.e. as a requirement in their job descriptions).</p>	<p>Priority: [medium]</p>
<p>Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>UNFPA recognizes the importance of reviewing and revising the job classifications and job descriptions of different positions within the evaluation function. For HQ-based staff, mobility should be encouraged in accordance with the UNFPA People Strategy and existing human resources policies. The value of country-level M&E staff reporting to the Representative and regional M&E advisors reporting to the Regional Director on evaluation matters, with a secondary (dotted) reporting line to the Evaluation Office is fully agreed.</p>	

		The Evaluation Office, Division of Human Resources, Policy and Strategy Division and Regional Offices will continue to work together to further strengthen the evaluation function at UNFPA.			
<i>If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:</i>					
<i>If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued</i>					
Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify <u>only one</u> per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [only one per action point]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
1a. Rotation within the monitoring & evaluation job group	Accepted. The principle that rotation within the monitoring & evaluation (M&E) job group (Headquarters/Regional Offices) should be encouraged together with other mobility modalities, for example, inter-agency loans and stretch-assignment, towards strengthening staff learning and career pathways, will be included in the updated Evaluation Policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>PSD, ROs</i>
	Re-competing non-rotational positions at the end of the tour of duty will be explored in the context of the DHR Staff Mobility Policy and ensuring no discrimination within the oversight function.	12/31/2025	<i>Division for Human Resources</i>	Director, DHR	
1b. Regional M&E Advisers should report directly to the Regional Director on evaluation matters, with a secondary	Accepted. The reporting lines will be re-assessed and revised in the updated Evaluation Policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session.	12/31/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>PSD, DHR, ROs</i>

(dotted) reporting line to the Evaluation Office.	Once the revised Evaluation Policy is approved by the Executive Board, the Job Description of Regional M&E Advisors will be updated to reflect the revised reporting lines.		<i>Division for Human Resources</i>	Director, DHR	
1c. Country Office M&E officers/focal points should report directly to the Representative	Accepted. The reporting lines will be re-assessed and revised in the updated Evaluation Policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>PSD, DHR, ROs, COs</i>
	Once the revised Evaluation Policy is approved by the Executive Board, the Job Description of Country Office M&E officers/focal points will be updated to reflect the revised reporting lines.	12/31/2024	<i>Division for Human Resources</i>	Director, DHR	

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 2	Recommendation 2: To ensure adequate quality and independence, strategic Country Programme Evaluations should be managed by the regional office.	Priority: [high]
	<p>This will require increasing the evaluation capacity at the regional office level. UNFPA may wish to consider the following options for increasing evaluation capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Increasing the evaluation capacity of the current Regional M&E Adviser with an additional position of Evaluation Specialist at P3/4 level. (b) Separating the evaluation functions from the other functions of the Regional M&E Adviser and creating a new stand-alone P5 Regional Evaluation Adviser position. (c) Increasing the planning and programming advisory capacity in the regional office to enable the Regional M&E Adviser to focus on the evaluation function. (d) A combination of these options. 	
Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>UNFPA recognizes the importance of ensuring the quality and independence of CPEs and the direct link with evaluation capacity at the RO level. The Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisors have a large and varied workload, including planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting components. The Regional M&E advisors have been receiving steady</p>	

	support from EO for the past number of years. EO has reviewed and cleared the TORs for CPEs, as well as the evaluation teams selected to conduct the CPEs. Whereas this support has been strong and steady, additional modalities to increase independence of CPEs will be explored.				
<i>If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:</i>					
<i>If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued</i>					
Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify only one per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify only one per action point only]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
2a. Strategic Country Programme Evaluations should be managed by the regional office	The principle that select Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs) should be managed by the regional office will be integrated in the updated Evaluation Policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session. Clear criteria to determine which CPEs should be managed by either RO or EO will be spelled out.	06/30/2024	Evaluation Office	Director, EO	ROs
2b. Increase the current evaluation capacity with additional positions of Evaluation Specialists at P4 level covering each region	UNFPA will establish additional positions of Evaluation Specialists at P4 level covering each region to enhance the capabilities to manage CPEs and other typology of evaluations, including humanitarian evaluations	12/31/2024	Office of the Executive Director	Chief of Staff	EO, DMS, DHR, ROs

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 3	Recommendation 3. UNFPA should strengthen evaluation quality assurance and the quality assessment system.	Priority: [high]
	<p>This entails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Reviewing the quality criteria used and the performance of the service provider in assessing evaluation deliverables to improve the robustness of the assessments and raise the quality bar. (b) In future, all evaluations, including country-level project evaluations, should go through the external evaluation quality assessment system. If recommendation 2 is implemented, capacity should be sufficient at RO level for the clearing of TORs and evaluation teams for country managed evaluations. 	

(c) Ensuring that evaluation reference groups are established for all evaluations, that they include both internal and external experts and stakeholders, and that their composition be indicated in the acknowledgements section of the final report.

Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status
 [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]

Accepted.

Quality assurance and quality assessment are foundational elements of evaluative work and the evaluation function. Without these aspects, the evaluation function is not credible.

The Evaluation Office has revised the evaluation quality assessment template in recent years to include elements where guidance has been developed – such as, integrating social and environmental standards, the principles of ‘leaving no one behind and reaching the furthest behind first’, and disability inclusion into evaluations. Further, the EO is revising the contract for EQA, which provides an opportunity to review the system and substantive elements.

The inclusion of all decentralized evaluations in the EQA system will represent a significant increase in the overall volume of reports being quality assessed. As such, the EO will adopt a phased approach wherein all decentralized evaluations will be quality assessed by the end of this Strategic Plan period.

If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:

If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued

Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify only one per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify only one per action point only]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
3a. Review the evaluation quality assessment system	Accepted. The evaluation quality assessment system will be revised	12/31/2023	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	ROs
3b. All evaluations should go through the evaluation quality assessment system	Accepted. The principle that all evaluations should go through the evaluation quality assessment system will be defined in the updated Evaluation Policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	ROs
	All evaluations will be quality-assessed reaching 100% coverage by 12/31/2025.	06/30/2025	<i>Evaluation office</i>	Director, EO	ROs

3c. Ensure evaluation reference groups are established for all evaluations.	Accepted. The principle that evaluation reference groups are established for all evaluations, that they include both internal and external experts and stakeholders will be included in the revised methodological guidance.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>ROs</i>
---	--	------------	--------------------------	--------------	------------

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 4	Recommendation 4. A higher budget threshold for country programme and regional programme evaluations should be established to ensure that funding is sufficient for the conduct of quality evaluations.	Priority: [medium]
-----------------------------	--	-----------------------

Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>UNFPA agrees that it is important that sufficient funding is available to carry out a good quality CPE. It is also important to ensure that there is flexibility for smaller Country Offices to conduct CPEs with more limited budgets.</p> <p>The Evaluation Office will work with Regional Offices to establish budget thresholds for different types of Country Offices. This “scaled approach” will be discussed within the organization, including in light of the existing “ring-fencing” mechanism of CPE budgets.</p>
--	---

If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:

If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued

Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify <u>only one</u> per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify <u>only one</u> per action point only]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
Higher budget threshold for country programme and regional programme evaluations.	Accepted. Detailed criteria for a scaled budget thresholds for country programme and regional programme evaluations will be established.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	PSD, DMS, ROs

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 5	Recommendation 5. Map and strengthen evaluation coverage.	Priority: [high]
	<p>(a) In the next policy, reconsider and revise the criteria used for the selection of evaluation topics and triggers for evaluations to ensure that the coverage and types of evaluations commissioned are responsive to the needs of the primary users of UNFPA evaluations and coverage of the overall organizational strategy (including humanitarian outcomes).</p> <p>(b) UNFPA should also consider expanding the range of targeted evaluation products to include lighter cross-evaluation evidence synthesis/summaries in response to ad hoc management needs for analysis.</p> <p>(c) Management should update and share costed evaluation plans annually to ensure that all of the organization’s evaluation work is supported, quality assured and contributes to organizational learning. The Evaluation Office should consolidate and publish the centralized and decentralized evaluation plan – as well as all evaluations with their management responses.</p>	

Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	Accepted.
	<p>UNFPA agrees that it is important to strengthen evaluation coverage. There is a need for increased flexibility and an ability to respond to triggers for evaluative evidence that may arise once the Quadrennial Evaluation Budget Plan has been finalized.</p> <p>The Evaluation Office has maintained an open and active dialogue with senior management to identify issues of concern and knowledge gaps. Work is underway to develop tools and systems driven by Artificial Intelligence to strengthen all aspects of the evaluation function, including meta-synthesis. This pilot project is unique within UNFPA and the UN as ITSO and EO are collaborating with Google to support the development of a platform specifically for evaluation.</p> <p>UNFPA will develop a system whereby costed evaluation plans are consolidated and shared on an annual basis. The Evaluation Office will examine efficient ways of publishing the plans for centralized and decentralized evaluations and will work closely with PSD to ensure that all decentralized evaluations are published along with their management responses.</p>

If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:

If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued

Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify <u>only one</u> per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff <i>Owner</i>	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
---------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------	---	---	---

				[specify only one per action point only]	
5a. Revise the criteria used for the selection of evaluation topics and triggers for evaluations	Accepted. The revised Evaluation Policy will include additional criteria for the selection of evaluation topics and will define triggers for different evaluations.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>HRD, PSD, ROs,</i>
5b. Expand the range of targeted evaluation products.	Accepted. EO will expand the types of evaluation synthesis products, including by exploring the use of artificial intelligence.	12/31/2025	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	
5c. Update and share costed evaluation plans and consolidate and publish the centralized and decentralized evaluation plan.	Accepted. The revised evaluation policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish the practice that costed evaluation plans are reviewed, updated and shared annually • Ensure that EO will consolidate and publish the centralized and decentralized evaluation plan • Ensure PSD will guide and oversee that management responses for all evaluations are timely developed, monitored and published. 	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>PSD, ROs</i>

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 6	Recommendation 6. Improve the utility of Country Programme Evaluations and Regional Programme Evaluations by:	Priority: [high]			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) strengthening the strategic scoping and key evaluation questions (b) increasing flexibility in costed evaluation plans so that these evaluations are triggered by changes in country or regional context and not only by the routine of the programme cycle (see also recommendation 6) (c) allocating an adequate level of resources (see also recommendation 4) (d) instituting dissemination and engagement plans which need to be customized to the context and evidence needs (e) build in stronger dimensions of national engagement and capacity development through CPE processes. 				
Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>UNFPA fully recognizes the importance of improving the utility of CPEs and RPEs. A considerable amount of work has been done in past years to improve guidance and enhance capacity at both regional and country level to ensure that these evaluations are used to inform regional and country planning and programming.</p> <p>The CPE Handbook and Toolkit are undergoing a major revision, which will include all elements suggested by the Peer Review. This revision process will include a communication and dissemination campaign to ensure a high degree of awareness and uptake across UNFPA.</p>				
<i>If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:</i>					
<i>If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued</i>					
Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify only one per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify only one per action point only]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
6a. Strengthening the strategic scoping and key evaluation questions	Accepted. The CPE Handbook and Toolkit will be revised, including with the aim to strengthening the scoping of CPEs and identification of evaluation questions.	12/31/2023	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Decentralized Evaluation team Leader, EO	<i>PSD, ROs</i>
6b. increasing flexibility in costed evaluation plans	Accepted. The revised evaluation policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session will establish the practice that costed evaluation plans are reviewed, updated and shared annually.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>PSD, ROs</i>

6c. allocating an adequate level of resources (see also recommendation 4)	Accepted. Detailed criteria for a scaled budget thresholds for country programme and regional programme evaluations will be established.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>PSD, DMS, ROs</i>
6d. instituting dissemination and engagement plans which need to be customized to the context and evidence needs	Accepted. The CPE Handbook and Toolkit will strengthen guidance on dissemination and engagement plans	1/31/2023	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Decentralized Evaluation team Leader, EO	<i>PSD, ROs</i>
	The revised Evaluation Policy will ensure dissemination and engagement plans are institutionalized	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>		
6e. build in stronger dimensions of national engagement and capacity development through CPE processes.	Accepted. The CPE Handbook and Toolkit will strengthen national engagement and capacity development through CPE processes.	12/31/2023	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Decentralized Evaluation team Leader, EO	<i>PSD, ROs</i>

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 7	Recommendation 7. Strengthen efforts to track evaluation use/uptake within UNFPA.	Priority: [medium]			
	(a) Review and report on evaluation follow up for <u>all</u> centralized and decentralized evaluations e.g. Annual Report on the Evaluation Function (b) Routine spot checking of management self-reported implementation (c) Analyze the extent to which joint and system-wide evaluations are contributing to coverage of UNFPAs strategic plan and to change within UNFPA.				
Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	Accepted. Ensuring the use of evaluation evidence is a fundamental evaluation principle, along with independence and credibility. The Evaluation Office recognizes the importance of enhancing the use of evaluation evidence and articulated this in the 'Strategy to enhance use through communications and knowledge management, 2022-2025'. The well-developed communication package for centralized evaluations will be shared with RO and COs to enhance the dissemination of decentralized evaluation results. Whereas the Annual Report on the Evaluation Function does not provide sufficient space for a full reporting on the follow up and use of all centralized and decentralized evaluations, efforts will be taken to increase the reporting on a broader range of decentralized evaluations, as well as on joint and system-wide evaluation contributions to the UNFPA Strategic Plan objectives, transformative results and accelerators. PSD will strengthen the implementation of management responses to evaluations.				
<i>If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:</i>					
<i>If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued</i>					
Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify only one per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify only one per action point]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
7a. Review and report on evaluation follow up for <u>all</u> centralized and decentralized evaluations	Accepted. The Evaluation Office will expand its reporting on evaluation follow up for both centralized and selected decentralized evaluations in the framework of the Annual Report on Evaluation Function to be presented to the Executive Board in the Annual regular session each year.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>ROs</i>

	ROs and COs will report in their respective annual reports on the follow up and use of country-level and regional-level evaluations	12/31/2024	<i>Policy and Strategy Division</i>	Director, PSD	<i>ROs and COs</i>
7b. Routine spot checking of management self-reported implementation	Accepted. OIAS will institutionalize spot checking of management self-reported implementation of evaluation recommendation when conducting country, regional and HQ offices internal audits by including a specifically dedicated section in the respective internal audit reports.	06/30/2024	<i>Office of Audit and Investigation Services</i>	Director, OAIS	
7c. Analyze the extent to which joint and system-wide evaluations are contributing to coverage of UNFPAs strategic plan and to change within UNFPA.	Accepted. The EO will include an analysis of the extent to which joint and SWEs are contributing to coverage of UNFPAs strategic plan in the framework of the Annual Report on Evaluation Function to be presented to the Executive Board in the Annual regular session each year.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 8	Recommendation 8. Clearer coverage targets, triggers and standard costs for different types of evaluations (including humanitarian) should be established.	Priority: [high]
	Based on this, (a) the adequacy of financial resources allocated to the evaluation function at different levels of UNFPA should be reassessed, and (b) additional mechanisms considered for ringfencing funding (e.g., creation of a pooled fund, earmarking as a % of total project budget, etc.) including for UNFPAs humanitarian work.	
Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	Accepted. The Evaluation Office agrees with the importance of clarifying coverage targets, triggers and standard costs for different types of evaluation. The need to increase the evaluation coverage of UNFPA's humanitarian response, which has increased considerably in past years, is an organizational priority. Work is underway to assess the expected demand for various types of evaluation and the related evaluation costs. Different funding models are being explored. The agreement reached will be included in the revised Evaluation Policy to be presented to the Executive Board for consideration in the first regular session of 2024.	

If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:					
If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued					
Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify <u>only one</u> per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify <u>only one</u> per action point only]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
8a. the adequacy of financial resources allocated to the evaluation function at different levels of UNFPA should be reassessed	Accepted. UNFPA will conduct a financial analysis of the projected cost of a full fledge evaluation function, and will integrate a revised target for resource allocation to the evaluation function in the revised evaluation policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director, EO	<i>PSD, DMS, HRD</i>
8b. additional mechanisms considered for ringfencing funding (e.g., creation of a pooled fund, earmarking as a % of total project budget, etc.) including for UNFPAs humanitarian work.	Accepted. UNFPA will establish an Evaluation Pooled Fund to leverage Other Resources to fund project-level evaluations, including humanitarian evaluations.	06/30/2024	<i>Office of the Executive Director</i>	Chief of Staff	<i>EO, DHR, PSD, DMS, HRD, RMB</i>
PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)					
Recommendation No. 9	Recommendation 9. Institutional and human resource capacities for humanitarian evaluations should be strengthened.		Priority: [high]		
	<p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) ensuring coherence between the next Evaluation Policy and Emergency SOPs vis a vis humanitarian reviews and evaluations; (b) agreeing to and establishing a funding mechanism for humanitarian evaluations from Other Resources; and (c) strengthening human resource capacities for humanitarian evaluations in the Evaluation Office, regional offices, and country offices. 				
Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>UNFPA fully recognizes the need for increased institutional and human resource capacities to carry out humanitarian evaluations. This increasingly important area of work for UNFPA will need an adequate evaluative response.</p>				

		<p>The Evaluation Office's work in this area has begun through the EO's participation in the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation network, as well as interaction with ALNAP (Strengthening humanitarian action through evaluation and learning) and the UN Evaluation Group's Humanitarian Evaluation Interest Group. However, these are largely external exercises and networks. The focus needs to shift to internal capacities to evaluate UNFPA's humanitarian work throughout the world.</p> <p>The EO has secured a humanitarian evaluation expert on secondment for 6-months to help develop guidance on humanitarian evaluations. A business case is being developed to increase the number of staff dedicated to humanitarian evaluations, as well as to develop a formal mechanism to fund humanitarian evaluations from Other Resources.</p>			
<i>If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:</i>					
<i>If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued</i>					
Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify <u>only one</u> per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify <u>only one</u> per action point]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
9a. Coherence between the next Evaluation Policy and Emergency SOPs vis a vis humanitarian reviews and evaluations;	Accepted. The revised evaluation policy to be presented for consideration to the Executive Board at the first 2024 regular Session will reflect UNFPA's increased humanitarian response programming and define the evaluation coverage requirements.	06/30/2024	<i>Evaluation Office</i>	Director of EO	<i>Humanitarian Response Division,</i>
9b. Funding mechanism for humanitarian evaluations from Other Resources	Accepted. UNFPA will establish one Evaluation Pooled Fund to leverage Other Resources to fund project-level evaluations, including humanitarian evaluations.	06/30/2024	<i>Office of the Executive Director</i>	Chief of Staff	<i>EO, DHR, PSD, DMS, HRD, RMB</i>
9c. Strengthening human resource capacities for humanitarian evaluations in the Evaluation Office, regional offices and country offices.	Accepted. A Humanitarian Evaluation Team with a one P4 and P2 positions to be led by an existing P5 position will be established to increase the capacity for humanitarian evaluations.	06/30/2024	<i>Office of the Executive Director</i>	Chief of Staff	<i>EO, DMS, DHR</i>
	UNFPA will establish additional positions of Evaluation Specialists at P4 level covering each region to enhance the capabilities to manage CPEs and other typology of evaluations, including humanitarian evaluations.	06/30/2024	<i>Office of the Executive Director</i>	Chief of Staff	<i>EO, DMS, DHR</i>

<p>between these two functions defined.</p>	<p>Partially accepted. As a more expedient response, the Evaluation Policy will be amended to provide greater clarity on the aims and principles for coordination between the evaluation and audit functions, and thereby will be aligned with the current (and anticipated revised) version of the OAI Charter (provision per Section 7, para 64).</p>	<p>06/30/2024</p>			
<p>10b. OAI could consider introducing in its compliance audits key aspects of the Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Strategy. This could include auditing the establishment of appropriate posts and job descriptions, reporting lines, quality assurance processes, establishment of evaluation reference groups, and the publication of all evaluations and implementation of management responses.</p>	<p>Accepted. OAI will introduce in its CO and RO audit the compliance with requirements regarding the establishment of appropriate M&E posts and job descriptions, reporting lines, quality of self-reporting of implementation of evaluations' management responses, establishment of evaluation reference groups.</p>	<p>06/30/2024</p>	<p><i>Office for Audit and Investigation Services</i></p>	<p>Director, OAI</p>	<p><i>ROs, COs, PSD</i></p>

PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATION(S) AND PROPOSED ACTION POINT(S)

Recommendation No. 11	Recommendation 11. The theory of change and UNFPAs strategy for national evaluation capacity development and system strengthening needs to be developed and discussed by senior management to ensure that the next policy and strategy more fully reflects organizational commitment and accountabilities at all levels for its implementation.	Priority: [medium]
------------------------------	--	-----------------------

Management Response to Recommendation acceptance status [Accepted/Partially Accepted/Rejected]	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>The Evaluation Strategy 2022-2025 includes an intended outcome related to national evaluation capacity development: “National evaluation capacity is strengthened through multi-stakeholder partnerships at global, regional and national levels, including with other United Nations organizations to accelerate the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030 with a focus on leaving no one behind.”</p> <p>Evaluation capacity development is mainstreamed throughout the current Evaluation Strategy with the aim of strengthening the relevance, quality and use of evaluations. In UNFPA, evaluation capacity development activities are conceptualized to strengthen both individual and institutional capacities, while also enhancing a culture of, and an enabling environment for evaluation. Each level can be strengthened independently; nonetheless success comes from a systemic and comprehensive approach to the development of all three.</p> <p>The evaluation capacity development efforts have been synchronized with internal and United Nations system-wide efforts, including the recent launch of the UNFPA self-paced e-learning course on evaluation.</p> <p>The revised Evaluation Strategy 2025-2029 will revisit the commitments to NECD and ensure that there is a strong alignment with organizational commitments and accountabilities for its implementation at global, regional and country levels.</p>
--	---

If recommendation is partially accepted or rejected, provide reasons:

If recommendation is accepted or partially accepted, list, below, action(s) that will logically lead to its implementation, ideally within a year of the date recommendation was issued

Action point title	Action point text	Due date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Lead implementing unit [specify only one per action point only]	Lead implementing and reporting staff Owner [specify only one per action point]	Additional units involved in implementation (if any)
--------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	---	---	--

<p>Theory of change and UNFPAs strategy for national evaluation capacity development and system strengthening needs to be developed and discussed by senior management to ensure that the next policy and strategy more fully reflects organizational commitment and accountabilities at all levels for its implementation.</p>	<p>Accepted. The Theory of change and UNFPAs strategy for national evaluation capacity development and system strengthening will be updated within the 2026-2029 Evaluation Strategy</p>	<p>12/31/2025</p>	<p><i>Evaluation Office</i></p>	<p>Director, EO</p>	<p><i>PSD</i></p>
---	--	-------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------