



INSPECTION AND EVALUATION DIVISION

United Nations Secretariat Evaluation Dashboard 2014-2015

19 June 2017

Assignment No.: IED-17-003

INSPECTION AND EVALUATION DIVISION

FUNCTION

“The Office shall evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the programmes and legislative mandates of the Organisation. It shall conduct programme evaluations with the purpose of establishing analytical and critical evaluations of the implementation of programmes and legislative mandates, examining whether changes therein require review of the methods of delivery, the continued relevance of administrative procedures and whether the activities correspond to the mandates as they may be reflected in the approved budgets and the medium-term plan of the Organisation;”
(General Assembly [Resolution 48/218 B](#)).

CONTACT INFORMATION

OIOS/IED Contact Information:
phone: +1 212-963-8148; fax: +1 212-963-1211; email: ied@un.org

(EDDIE) YEE WOO GUO, DIRECTOR
Tel: +1 917-367-3674, Fax: +1 212-963-1211
e-mail: guoy@un.org

Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	5
About the Dashboard.....	5
Changes.....	6
Follow up to Biennial Report.....	8
PART I. SECRETARIAT EVALUATION DASHBOARD.....	9
United Nations Secretariat Evaluation Dashboard.....	10
PART II. ENTITY EVALUATION DASHBOARDS.....	11
Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)/Department of Field Support (DFS).....	12
Department of Political Affairs (DPA).....	14
Office of Disarmament Affairs (ODA).....	16
Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).....	18
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).....	20
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).....	22
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).....	24
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP).....	26
Economic Commission for Africa (ECA).....	28
Economic Commission for Europe (ECE).....	30
Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).....	32
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA).....	34
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).....	36
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women).....	38
United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat).....	40
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).....	42
International Trade Centre (ITC).....	44
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).....	46
United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (OOSA).....	48
Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS).....	50
Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA).....	52
Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA).....	54
Department of Management (DM).....	56
Department of Public Information (DPI).....	58
Department for General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM).....	60
Department of Safety and Security (DSS).....	62
United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG).....	64
Office of Legal Affairs (OLA).....	66
United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV).....	68
United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON).....	70
PART III. ANNEXES.....	72
Annex I. List of entities included in the report.....	73
Annex II. Description of indicators and data sources.....	74

Annex III. Methodology for reports review and calculation of financial indicators 80
Annex IV. Quality Assessment Sheet 81
Annex V. Comments from Secretariat Entities 86

INTRODUCTION

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) is pleased to present the 2014-2015 Evaluation Dashboard) – previously known as the Evaluation Scorecards - for the 2014-2015 biennium.
2. This is the third in a series of reports that accompanies the OIOS biennial report on “Strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings in programme design, delivery and policy directives” (A/72/72) (‘Biennial Report’). The fifteenth Biennial Report was completed in March 2017 and will be presented to the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) in June 2017. As before, while the Biennial Report presents an aggregate assessment of evaluation capacity and practice covering Secretariat and other UN entities subject to evaluation by OIOS-IED (see Annex 1 for the list of entities covered), the Dashboard provides the same assessment at the entity level.¹ The data and analytical methodology employed in the preparation of the Dashboard, as well as the limitations, thus correspond with those of the Biennial Report.
3. OIOS is grateful to the entities for providing feedback on the visualisation and indicators included in the Dashboard through a series of informal consultations. Where appropriate, these comments have been taken on board. Entities were also invited to provide information on the extent to which the function had engaged in those evaluation activities during the 2014-2015 biennium that did not result in evaluation reports as well as areas of improvement in their evaluation function since then. Finally, Heads of Departments and Offices included in the report were invited to provide comments on the formal draft of the Dashboard. These comments are appended at the end of the report.

About the Dashboard

4. The purpose of the Evaluation Dashboard is to provide an assessment of evaluation – including framework, resources, reports and their quality – for each of the Secretariat entities included in the Biennial Report (see Annex 1 for a list of entities). The goal is to support the strengthening of the evaluation function across the Secretariat, by providing the data that management need to determine which aspects of the evaluation function are operating well, and where there is room for improvement, while giving due consideration to their evaluation resources both in absolute terms as well as in proportion to the total programme budget. Evaluation professionals may use the Dashboard to highlight the context within which they operate, and the quality and quantity of outputs they produce. The Dashboard should be considered in its entirety with the indicators assessed in conjunction with each other. For example, fewer outputs could be viewed in the context of low resources assigned to evaluation, or gaps in the evaluation framework may, over time, be addressed to eventually result in improved report quality.
5. The Dashboard presents data on 16 indicators, classified across four categories: evaluation framework, resources, evaluation reports and quality of reports. A more detailed explanation is provided in Annex 2.

¹ As per PPBME regulations (ST/SGB/2016/6, article VII, rule 107.2b), all entities must undertake self-evaluation. The evaluation system of the United Nations includes evaluation undertaken by the entity itself, as well as in-depth evaluation undertaken at the request of the Committee for Programme and Coordination.

1. Type of function: The structure of evaluation function within the entity, if any
2. Reporting line: The extent to which the evaluation function reporting line is independent
3. Level of senior most evaluation professional in the centralised/corporate evaluation office of an entity
4. Policy score: Number of criteria met, out of 19 criteria
5. Procedures in use: Number of procedures in use, out of 6 procedures recommended by OIOS (in A/70/72)
6. Plan score: Number of criteria met, out of 8 criteria
- 7a. Monitoring and evaluation budget (US\$, million)
- 7b. Monitoring and evaluation budget as a proportion of total budget (percent)
- 8a. Expenditure on evaluation reports (US\$, million)
- 8b. Expenditure on evaluation reports as a proportion of total budget (percent)
9. Evaluation reports (#): Number of evaluation reports screened by OIOS
10. Number of subprogrammes referenced by evaluation reports (of the total number of subprogrammes in the entity)
11. Report quality: Percent sampled reports ranked ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ in the quality assessment
12. Recommendations in reports: Percent of sampled reports which were ranked ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ for their recommendations in the quality assessment
13. Gender in reports: Percent of sampled reports which had some or strong evidence of gender considerations in report methodology and/or findings.
14. Human rights in reports: Percent of sampled reports which had some or strong evidence of human rights considerations in report methodology and/or findings.

6. The development of these indicators was guided by the United Nations norms and standards for evaluation, developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and supported by Member States in General Assembly resolution 67/226. The indicators also respond to the comments and feedback obtained from entities during consultations for the current and prior rounds of Scorecards/Dashboard.

7. The Dashboard report is presented in two parts. Part 1 provides the Evaluation Dashboard for the Secretariat. Part 2 presents individual entity Dashboards. This includes a description of the status of the indicators for that entity, as well as a four part cover sheet, which consists of entity objectives and key features of evaluation function in 2014-2015, as assessed by OIOS, as well as self-reported information by the entity on those evaluation activities which did not result in evaluation reports undertaken during the biennium and key enhancements to the evaluation function, introduced since then.

Changes

8. The purpose of the Scorecards was to support the strengthening of the evaluation function across the Secretariat. It is the objective of OIOS to do so through a strategy which acknowledges differences across Secretariat entities, and at the same time reinforces certain minimum established standards. To do this even more effectively, and in response to the consultations and feedback from the entities, the Dashboard has evolved since the previous biennium. Some of the changes to the report are documented below:

- a. In light of the progress made by several evaluation functions, indicators for the ‘Framework’ category (formerly split across ‘Structure’ and ‘Practice’) have been consolidated into a key set, deemed to be fundamental in establishing a strong evaluation function.

- b. Resources are now presented in absolute terms, as well as in proportion to programme size.
- c. Data from a survey of screened reports, which was undertaken for the first time as a part of the current Biennial report, was used to provide additional information and populate four indicators on evaluation reports, drawing on data that has not been available to OIOS until now.
- d. Overall, there is a shift toward the use of documentary evidence or data assessed by OIOS, instead of self-reported measures.
- e. Where possible, indicators are presented in their ‘raw’ or ‘source’ form to maintain transparency, instead of being scaled or processed further.
- f. Secretariat averages, and a JIU recommendation, have been included as appropriate as benchmarks.
- g. The RAG colour coding system (red, amber, green) has been introduced for the following: indicator 2, which examines the extent of independence of the evaluation function; indicators 4 and 5, which measure the completeness of policy and procedures; indicators 6, 11 and 12, which assess adherence to standards set by OIOS (based on UNEG norms and standards); and indicators 13 and 14, which assess the extent of evidence found in reports on incorporation of gender and human rights. Within the context of each indicator, the colours indicate high, medium and low achievement. Colours have not been used for the sections on ‘Resources’ or ‘Evaluation reports’. Grey bars are used to depict indicator status while arrows represent the direction of change since the previous biennium.
- h. Entities continue to be categorized based on their substantive functional role. Within each category, they are placed in decreasing order of budget allocation for Monitoring and Evaluation.

9. Data on monitoring and evaluation were obtained from OPPBA using Form 12, which comprises part of the budget submission made by entities on staffing allocation to monitoring and evaluation activities. However, the accuracy of these data, and reliability as measures of actual resources assigned to or spent on monitoring and evaluation are of concern. In some cases, evaluation allocations are for activities that are more reflective of monitoring. Some resources for evaluation, such as those from support accounts or extra-budgetary project funding, are not reported to OPPBA, and not published in the budget fascicles. Therefore the monitoring and evaluation budget data presented in indicators 7a and 7b for entities heavily funded through non-regular budget sources such as DPKO-DFS, UN-Women and ITC does not accurately reflect actual resources spent on evaluation. In such cases, available data for expenditure on evaluation have been footnoted beneath the entity Dashboard. Moreover, allocations are sometimes based on historic submissions rather than actual evaluation work plans. In the longer term, OIOS and DM have attempted to improve the quality of reporting in Form 12 by issuing revised guidelines for the 2018-2019 biennium. OIOS has also issued a Secretariat wide recommendation as part of the current Biennial Report, for entities to align their evaluation plans, budgetary allocations, and evaluation outputs (reports). Limitations of the data are further elaborated in the Biennial Report.²

10. In the short term, with the purpose of obtaining better data for 2014-2015, OIOS undertook a survey of screened reports, which asked focal points to report on expenditures on all reports screened by OIOS – work-month allocations of staff, consultancy costs, and other costs - for all screened reports. This source of data reflects a more accurate picture of resources assigned to evaluation across the Secretariat, and comprises the basis for indicators 8a through 10. It should be noted that the indicators on the number of reports and their quality include those evaluation reports produced by

² A/72/72.

the decentralized evaluation functions; while the framework indicators refer only to the centralized evaluation function.³

11. Finally, a few entities expressed concerns around the limited ability of the quality assessment tool to capture the substantive nuances across a broad range of reports. The quality assessment is of a general nature and aims to capture fairly generic elements of quality across the sampled reports. Therefore, indicators 11 through 14 are presented notwithstanding the diversity or specificity that is implicit across the 100 reports assessed.⁴

Follow up to Biennial Report

12. The Biennial Report noted some strengthening of evaluation functions in 2014-2015, with respect to the adoption of evaluation policies and plans. It also noted that while the number of evaluation reports fell, their quality remained the same and reported outcomes improved. Senior management support once again emerged as a determining factor for a strong evaluation function. The report also noted, however, that the budgeted allocations for evaluation far exceeded the reported expenses on evaluation reports for several entities, suggesting inaccuracies in reporting evaluation budgets. OIOS made one recommendation to address this shortcoming:

Budgeting of evaluation resources should be better aligned with evaluation plans, and evaluation outputs should be better reflected in such plans and budgets.

13. In its June 2015 session, the CPC endorsed recommendations from the Biennial Report for 2012-2013 (A/70/72). In addition, the CPC emphasized the critical nature of a strong evaluation function across the Organization, and the need for Secretariat entities to allocate appropriate resources to evaluation activity, ensuring that staff working on evaluation possessed the necessary competencies. It further recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to:

- a. Intensify his efforts to develop a more robust culture for evaluation throughout the Organization by strengthening senior management support and staff buy-in.
- b. Take further, concrete measures to develop capacity for evaluation within the Secretariat programmes, with support provided by OIOS and external oversight bodies in terms of guidance and methodological advice.
- c. Continue to ensure that Senior managers' compacts presented adequate programme objectives and performance measures in order to fulfil given mandates in accordance with relevant rules and regulations and that the evaluation function received due consideration in the performance appraisal of senior managers.
- d. Take concrete measures at the appropriate levels to ensure that the existing significant gaps in evaluation coverage and the lack of evaluative evidence on performance were addressed.⁵

14. OIOS has raised these recommendations to the Executive Office of the Secretary General, and looks forward to supporting the EOSG in its efforts to strengthen the role of evaluation throughout the Organization.

³ In the case of ECA this reflects staff-time spent on an evaluation conducted by a donor.

⁴ Quality assessment instrument presented in Annex IV. During the course of consultations on the development of the Dashboard, ECA clarified that their submitted evaluation report included in the sample was neither undertaken nor owned by them. ECA was therefore not in a position to substantively influence the quality of the final product. Hence, the quality indicators for this report have been removed from the ECA dashboard.

⁵ Para 95-109, A/70/16

PART I
SECRETARIAT EVALUATION DASHBOARD

UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT EVALUATION DASHBOARD

OVERALL DASHBOARD TABLE

2014-2015

		EVALUATION FRAMEWORK						RESOURCES		EVALUATION REPORTS				QUALITY OF REPORTS			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7a	7b	8a	8b	9	10	11	12	13	14
		Type of function	Reporting line	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	Policy score	Procedures in use (#)	Plan score	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	M&E as % of total programme budget	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	Evaluation reports (#)	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')	Gender in reports	Human rights in reports
Peace & security	DPKO/DFS	3		P-5				1.81	0.33%	0.34	0.06%	3	7/9				
	DPA	1		P-5				0.30	0.02%	0.31	0.02%	4	2/6				
	ODA	0						0.07	0.15%								
Human Rights and Humanitarian	OCHA	3		P-5				3.63	0.46%	1.33	0.17%	8					
	UNRWA	3		P-5				2.33	0.12%	1.17	0.06%	9	6/6				
	UNHCR	4		D-1				1.94	0.02%	1.45	0.01%	10					
	OHCHR	3		D-1				1.48	0.31%	0.98	0.21%	6	3/4				
Regional cooperation	ESCAP	3		P-4				2.35	1.68%	1.10	0.79%	10	8/8				
	ECA	3		P-5				2.22	1.00%	0.02	0.01%						
	ECE	2		P-5				1.22	1.13%	0.02	0.02%	2	1/8				
	ECLAC	2		P-4				0.96	0.69%	1.03	0.74%	12	9/14				
	ESCWA	2		D-2				0.33	0.40%	0.38	0.45%	9	7/7				
Norm setting & development	UNODC	4		P-5				3.88	0.54%	2.58	0.36%	46	7/10				
	UN Women	4		D-1				3.61	0.67%	2.37	0.44%	41	2/2				
	UN-Habitat	4		P-5				3.11	0.79%	0.68	0.17%	8	7/7				
	UNEP	4		D-1				2.70	0.44%	3.22	0.52%	52	7/7				
	ITC	3		P-4				2.26	1.25%	0.90	0.50%	4	6/6				
	UNCTAD	4		P-4				1.77	0.79%	0.92	0.41%	14	5/5				
	OOSA	1						0.49	5.11%								
	OHRLLS	1						0.29	1.91%								
	OSAA	1						0.15	0.85%								
	DESA	1						0.09	0.03%	0.15	0.05%	7	6/9				
Management & support	DM	1						5.89	0.66%	0.09	0.01%	2	2/5				
	DPI	4		P-4				4.56	2.31%	0.41	0.21%	1	2/3				
	DGACM	3		P-4				3.65	0.51%								
	DSS	3						2.58	1.00%								
	UNOG	1						0.84	0.42%								
	OLA	1						0.60	0.92%								
	UNOV	0						0.54	0.84%								
	UNON	0						0.31	0.52%								

Notes:
Empty white cells indicate: (i) lack of data or (ii) indicator is not applicable

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

PART II
ENTITY EVALUATION DASHBOARDS

Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) / Department of Field Support (DFS)
Dashboard Group: Peace and security
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support is to support the maintenance of peace and security through the deployment of peacekeeping operations in accordance with and by authority derived from the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 4.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.06% of total programme budget.
- None of the sampled reports were rated as good or excellent in terms of overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- The Evaluation Team of DPKO and DFS finalised the Evaluation of the Provision of Rations to Uniformed Personnel in UN Peacekeeping Missions, assisted the Office of Military Affairs in developing a Force Headquarters Evaluation Framework, prepared the Report of the Enabling Assets Assessment Team, a Member States survey on GFSS, provided support to the early stages of the review of intelligence structures in peacekeeping, and completed an after action review in UNDOF.
- Other offices in DPKO and DFS conducted over thirty various reports including lessons learned exercises, mission capability studies, civilian staff reviews, benchmarking exercises, capability studies, strategic reviews, special reports, management reviews, etc.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Implemented measures to ensure a stronger gender and human right perspective in evaluations, including working with the DPKO/DFS Gender Team to prepare a toolkit to standardise gender aspects in all evaluations.
- Revised the consultation process in order to enhance the selection of evaluation topics and ensure a focus on most useful and urgent evaluation topics related to peacekeeping.
- Continued to enhance coordination and synergies with OIOS evaluation and audit sections.
- Convened a meeting of all evaluation entities whose work also related to or impacts upon peacekeeping, including the DPKO and DFS Office of Peacekeeping Strategic Partnerships, the Knowledge Management and Guidance Team in DPET, DPKO and DFS, OIOS, DPA and DBF.
- Continued tracking system of implementation of evaluation recommendations and followed up with various DPKO and DFS with outstanding evaluation recommendations.
- Continued to ensure inclusion of evaluation activities in key budgeting, assessment and reporting documents across DPKO and DFS.

Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) / Department of Field Support (DFS)
Dashboard Group: Peace and security
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		—
	2	Reporting line	3/3		—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score	16/19		—
	5	Procedures in use (#)	5/6		NEW
	6	Plan score	6/8		▼
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	1.81		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%		▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.34		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%		NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	3		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	7/9		▼
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	0%		▼
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')	100%		—
	13	Gender in reports	50%		▼
	14	Human rights in reports	0%		▼

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 3 evaluation reports, 2 were sampled for quality assessment.

DPKO-DFS report that evaluation budget (not including staffing costs) for fiscal year 2013-2014 was \$255,057 and for 2014-2015 was \$250,980. Indicator 7a does not reflect actual resources spent on evaluation as it does not capture support account budget. Total programme budget does not include missions.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Department of Political Affairs (DPA)
Dashboard Group: Peace and security
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the programme is to maintain international peace and security by assisting Member States, at their request, and other international and regional organizations to resolve potentially violent disputes or conflict peacefully, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions emanating from the General Assembly and the Security Council. Wherever possible, this objective is achieved by preventing violent conflicts from arising through preventive diplomacy and peace making, through expansion of the United Nations range of partnerships with other international, regional and sub-regional organizations. (A/67/6/Rev.1, para. 2.1)

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation unit but evaluation activities took place; most senior professional with responsibility for evaluation was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted 0.02% of total programme budget.
- 40% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Production of annual Learning and Evaluation Plan detailing planned activities.
- Created “Implementation Tracker” to track progress on implementation of recommendations from evaluations.
- Internal dissemination of evaluation reports through Policy and Practice Database - an internal online repository for DPA and DPKO-DFS staff, both at HQ and in the field
- Promotion of Lessons Learned and After Action Reviews on Departmental activities at HQ and in the field to inform future operations.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Dedicated Evaluation Capacity (at the P4 level) recruited in the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for DPA with annual budget (reviewed on an annual basis).
- Revision of Departmental Evaluation Policy to be in line with UNEG Norms and Standards.
- Creation of a Senior Gender Advisor post, development of the Department’s Gender, Women and Peace and Security Strategy (2016-2019), and drafting of a Tip-Sheet on Gender Mainstreaming of work-plans is helping to promote gender mainstreaming in DPA.

**Department of Political Affairs (DPA)
Dashboard Group: Peace and security
2014-2015**

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line			▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score			—
	5	Procedures in use (#)			NEW
	6	Plan score			▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.30		▼
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.02%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.31		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.02%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	4		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	2/6		▼
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	40%		▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')	80%		▲
	13	Gender in reports	60%		▲
	14	Human rights in reports	60%		▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: DPA had a total of 10 evaluation reports, of which 6 were submitted directly by PBSO, which is listed in the Proposed Programme Fascicle as a sub-programme of DPA. Out of these 10, OIOS sampled 5 reports for inclusion in the quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Office of Disarmament Affairs (ODA)
Dashboard Group: Peace and security
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Office of Disarmament Affairs is general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 3.1).





II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Minimal or no evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff were reported.
- Evaluation policy and procedures were partially in place; evaluation plan was absent.
- No evaluation reports were submitted for OIOS review.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

Office of Disarmament Affairs (ODA)
Dashboard Group: Peace and security
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Minimal or no evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line		0/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score		13/19	▲
	5	Procedures in use (#)		2/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		0/8	—
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.07		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.15%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		—
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	13	Gender in reports		N/A	N/A
	14	Human rights in reports		N/A	N/A

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs are to ensure the timely, coherent and coordinated response of the international community to disasters and emergencies and to facilitate the smooth transition from emergency relief to rehabilitation and development. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 23.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy was in place; procedures were lacking and plan was partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted 0.17% of total programme budget.
- 50% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.











III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- OCHA provided leadership and strategic direction to system-wide humanitarian evaluations by chairing the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations Steering Group. OCHA also acted as secretariat of the group, organizing their meetings, preparing background papers etc.
- The IAHE Steering Group developed the IAHE Guidelines.
- On behalf of the Steering Group, OCHA coordinated the Syria Portal.
- Dissemination of evaluation findings and recommendations through social media products (Facebook, Twitter messages), preparation of press releases, etc.
- Tracking of and follow-up on the implementation of recommendations from evaluations, audits and other reviews, in an online database.
- Coordination with other entities conducting evaluations other reviews of OCHA's work, including OIOS and JIU, and providing inputs and responses.
- Presentations to OCHA managers and senior managers to increase their knowledge on the evaluation function and its utility.
- Briefs to OCHA SMT with updates on the evaluation function.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- OCHA has put in place most of the six evaluation procedures included in the assessment (evaluation workplan, action plans for implementing recommendations, monitoring the implementation of recommendations, disseminating evaluation reports and lessons learned) and aims to have implemented all six procedures by the end of the current year.
- Increased awareness of the importance of evaluations for accountability and learning across OCHA and among senior management, including awareness of the need for greater resources for the evaluation function.
- Following an independent review of Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations, the mechanism is being strengthened.
- Work on a new OCHA evaluation policy and guidelines is underway.

Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		—
	2	Reporting line		1/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score			19/19
	5	Procedures in use (#)		1/6	NEW
	6	Plan score			4/8
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	3.63		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.46%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	1.33		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	0.17%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	8		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)			N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')			50%
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')			100%
	13	Gender in reports			100%
	14	Human rights in reports			50%

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 8 evaluation reports, 4 were sampled for quality assessment.

OCHA note that indicator 7a includes resources for evaluation, and not for monitoring.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)
Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East is to protect, preserve and promote the health status of Palestine Refugees; meet the basic educational needs of Palestine refugees, in particular children and youth, and to improve their educational opportunities; and improve the standard of living and advance the rights of Palestine refugees through services provided to the poor and vulnerable. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, pages 510-512).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:











- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.06% of total programme budget.
- 40% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian 2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		—
	2	Reporting line		2/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score		16/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		3/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		7/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	2.33		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.12%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	1.17		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	0.06%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	9		▲
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	6/6		—
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		40%	▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		60%	▲
	13	Gender in reports		100%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		100%	▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 9 evaluation reports, 5 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the programme is to ensure international protection to refugees and others of concern to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and to seek permanent solutions to their problems in cooperation with States and other organizations, including through the provision of humanitarian assistance. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 21.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Stand-alone evaluation unit; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at D-1 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports was around 0.01% of total programme budget.
- 80% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- UNHCR issued a new evaluation policy in October 2016. (<http://www.unhcr.org/3d99a0f74>)

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Stand-alone evaluation unit		▲
	2	Reporting line		3/3	▬
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	D-1		NEW
	4	Policy score		15/19	▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		3/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		6/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	1.94		▼
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.02%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	1.45		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.01%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	10		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)			N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		80%	▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		80%	▲
	13	Gender in reports		100%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		80%	▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 10 evaluation reports, 5 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights is to promote and protect the effective enjoyment by all of all human rights. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 20.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at D-1 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.21% of total programme budget.
- 33% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.











III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Guidance and tools were developed during the biennium, including the establishment of budget requirements and a model of terms of reference for the evaluation of technical cooperation projects, as well as a template for the follow-up to evaluation recommendations.
- OHCHR is also an active member of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and has in particular dedicated resources to continue its co-leadership, with UN Women, with regard to the development of guidance on the integration of gender equality and human rights in evaluations, in the context of the overall work of the UNEG. The guidance was launched in August 2014.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- The follow-up action plans for the evaluations conducted in Central Asia, Mexico and OHCHR's support to National Human Rights Institutions have been submitted to the Programme and Budget Review Board (PBRB) for its endorsement and are being implemented.
- The terms of reference of the PBRB were updated to reflect this role in the implementation of evaluation recommendations, as well as the PBRB submission form that now request the inclusion of evaluation results relevant for the programme proposals submitted.
- A meta-analysis of the evaluations conducted since 2014 is being undertaken to generate inputs for the preparation of the OHCHR Management Plan 2018-2021.

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
Dashboard Group: Human rights and humanitarian
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		▲
	2	Reporting line		3/3	▬
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	D-1		NEW
	4	Policy score		17/19	▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		5/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		6/8	▼
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	1.48		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.31%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.98		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	0.21%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	6		▲
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	3/4		▲
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		33%	▼
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		100%	▬
	13	Gender in reports		100%	▬
	14	Human rights in reports		100%	▬

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 6 evaluation reports, 5 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific is to foster economic integration at the sub regional and regional levels; promote the regional implementation of the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals; and support regional sustainable development by helping to bridge economic, social and environmental gaps among member States and between sub-regions, through, among other things, trade and transport. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 16.6).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation staff was at P-4 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.79% of total programme budget.
- 60% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.











III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- As part of its efforts to strengthen the evaluation function, ESCAP organized training and briefing sessions on evaluation for ESCAP staff with a view to enhancing the design and evaluation of capacity development projects.
- ESCAP also participated in the activities of the regional United Nations Evaluation Development Group in Asia and the Pacific (UNEDAP), including the organization of the annual regional course on evaluation in the UN context, and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).
- In 2014, ESCAP hosted the annual UNEG Evaluation Week held in Bangkok for the first time. At which representatives from ESCAP member States engaged in a discussion on how evaluation could contribute to the post-2015 development agenda through a panel event.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

In January 2015, ESCAP introduced new internal procedures for planning and conducting evaluations through an internal memorandum from the Executive Secretary. These procedures aimed at ensuring that, firstly, evaluation consultants selected to conduct ESCAP evaluations are professional, qualified and independent and must possess the experiences and skills specified in the UNEG standards for evaluation in the UN system; and secondly, a reference group of appropriate composition is formalized for each evaluation conducted at ESCAP. The reference group provides technical and methodological guidance to the evaluation process and helps ensure that the evaluation adheres to the relevant ESCAP policy and guidelines on evaluation.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		—
	2	Reporting line		1/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-4		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		6/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	2.35		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	1.68%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	1.10		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	0.79%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	10		▲
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	8/8		—
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		60%	▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		20%	▼
	13	Gender in reports		80%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		20%	▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 10 evaluation reports, 5 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the programme is to assist African countries in formulating and implementing policies and programmes that will lead to sustainable economic growth and social development, with particular emphasis on poverty reduction as envisaged in the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and in the internationally agreed development goals, including those contained in the United Nations Millennium Declaration. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 15.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted 0.01% of total programme budget.
- The one report included in the sample for quality assessment was subsequently removed on clarification from ECA that it was neither undertaken nor owned by them.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

ECA conceptualized innovative instruments to measure and evaluate i) the influence that ECA is making in the policy landscape in Africa, ii) the credibility of its knowledge products and capacity development interventions, iii) accountability mechanisms at the corporate level as well as to measure the iv) efficiency of the Commission's operations. Such instruments include a yearly Partners survey targeting more than 2000 policymakers and beneficiaries of ECA services and an annual digital feedback surveys to assess the design, planning and organization of major corporate events such as the annual Conference of Finance and Planning Ministers and the African Development Forum. Other activities of ECA's evaluation Section include the substantive and technical backstopping of external evaluations, system wide reviews and audits.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- To streamline evaluation processes as well as to establish a harmonized evaluation practice, ECA developed guidelines, quality checklists and templates which are in line with UNEG norms and standards.
- ECA rolled out an on-line "Evaluation and Audit Tracking System (EATS)" to systematically track progress made against implementation of recommendations. The system allows risk owners to monitor and update on a quarterly basis the status of implementation. It is expected that over time, this knowledge base will enhance organizational learning and accountability.
- As part of ECA's Performance Management Dashboard (PMD) key performance indicators relevant to ECA's evaluation function are monitored and reported to the Senior Management Team on a quarterly basis.

**Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015**

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		—
	2	Reporting line			▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score			▲
	5	Procedures in use (#)			NEW
	6	Plan score			▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	2.22		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%		▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.02		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%		NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	13	Gender in reports			N/A
	14	Human rights in reports			N/A

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: One screened report for ECA was included in the aggregate results of the Quality Assessment presented in the Biennial Report. ECA subsequently clarified that the report was neither undertaken nor owned by them. It is therefore excluded from the Dashboard. Expenditures shown in indicators 8a and 8b reflect ECA staff time spent on coordinating an evaluation conducted by a donor.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

**Economic Commission for Europe (ECE)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015**

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Economic Commission for Europe is to promote sustainable development and regional cooperation and integration through policy dialogue, normative work and regional networks of experts. In addition, the ECE also promote technical cooperation with economies in transition, with a view to assisting them in acceding to and implementing international legal instruments, norms and standards. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 17.2 and 17.3).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Unit not dedicated to evaluation; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.02% of total programme budget.
- 50% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.











III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Approval by the UNECE Executive Committee (EXCOM) of the UNECE Evaluation Policy in October 2014.
- Approval by the EXCOM of the first Biennial Evaluation Workplan 2016-17, in October 2014.
- Development of the UNECE Evaluation Guide, which supports staff responsible for managing evaluations, and includes guidance on integrating gender and human rights in the evaluation design.
- Launch of the OpenUNECE website, where all evaluation reports published since October 2014, including management responses and progress reports are made publicly available.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Biennial Evaluation Workplans are regularly submitted to the UNECE Executive Committee (EXCOM) for approval.
- Reports of Programme-wide evaluations conducted in UNECE are submitted for EXCOM approval.
- The UNECE EXCOM have continuously called for the strengthening of evaluation, as recently as March 2017 requesting the Secretariat to produce an Annual Report on evaluation, which is presently under development.

**Economic Commission for Europe (ECE)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015**

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Unit not dedicated to evaluation		▲
	2	Reporting line		1/3	▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score		16/19	▲
	5	Procedures in use (#)		5/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	1.22		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	1.13%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.02		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	0.02%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	2		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	1/8		▼
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		50%	▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		100%	▬
	13	Gender in reports		50%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		0%	▬

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Both evaluation reports were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean are to foster economic integration at the subregional and regional levels; promote implementation of internationally agreed development goals, beyond 2015, in continuation of the Millennium Development Goals, and to support sustainable development by helping to bridge economic, social and environmental gaps between and among countries in the region and the industrialized economies. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para.18.3).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Unit not dedicated to evaluation; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-4 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.74% of total programme budget.
- 67% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.











III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Updating of ECLAC's Evaluation Policy and Strategy.
- Institutionalization of an improved system to implement and follow-up the recommendations resulting from full-fledged evaluations.
- Systematization of the most frequent and cross-cutting recommendations and lessons learned from all the evaluations conducted since 2009.
- Follow-up of the implementation of recommendations of the following evaluations:
 - Evaluation of the cooperation programme "Social protection and social inclusion in Latin America and the Caribbean".
 - ECLAC-AECID 2007-2009 technical cooperation programme evaluation.
 - Preparation of the implementation plan for the recommendations of the ECLAC-AECID 2010-2012 technical cooperation programme evaluation.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Updating and improvement of the system to follow-up on the implementation of evaluation recommendations to increase its effectiveness and extending the coverage of the follow-up process to all evaluations (8 follow-up processes in progress).
- Updating of the ECLAC Evaluation Policy and Strategy based on the new UNEG norms and Standards (document on approval process).
- Dissemination of a document systematizing the most frequent and cross-cutting recommendations and lessons learned from all the evaluations conducted between 2009 and 2014 and that can be applicable to the work of the Commission.
- Updating of the ECLAC Evaluation Guidelines (document under preparation).

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Unit not dedicated to evaluation		—
	2	Reporting line		1/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-4		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	▲
	5	Procedures in use (#)		3/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.96		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.69%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	1.03		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	0.74%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	12		▲
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	9/14		▼
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		67%	—
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		83%	▼
	13	Gender in reports		100%	—
	14	Human rights in reports		83%	▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 12 evaluation reports, 6 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

**Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015**

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia is to foster comprehensive, equitable, integrated and sustainable development through effective economic and social cooperation in the region, and to maintain and strengthen economic relations between the member countries of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) and with other countries, paying special consideration to least developed and conflict-stricken countries. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para.19.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Unit not dedicated to evaluation; most senior professional responsible for evaluation was at D-2 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.45% of total programme budget.
- 20% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- ESCWA undertook an in-depth meta-review of evaluations since 2012, drawing key recurrent good practices, lessons and trends.
- ESCWA also launched a new evaluation webpage open to the public, and an intranet page available to staff, making information and resources on evaluations readily available.
- ESCWA also revised and consolidated templates and checklists for inception and final evaluation reports, as well as evaluation plans, to ensure compliance with OIOS, UN-SWAP and UNEG standards. A unified template was developed for management response Action Plans of Subprogramme evaluations, focused on five key strategic areas.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- ESCWA's Subprogramme evaluations improved in quality and ownership through the introduction of Steering Groups with external experts and the organization of participatory final evaluation workshops with staff, where evaluation findings are validated, and evaluation recommendations jointly developed.
- ESCWA fully integrated gender in its evaluations and achieved the score "exceeds expectations" in the UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator.
- ESCWA's Evaluation Policy was revised and adapted to the 2016 UNEG Norms & Standards.
- Finally, ESCWA created a new mechanism to monitor the implementation of evaluation recommendations and set up an ESCWA-wide repository of key lessons learnt and recommendations.

Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)
Dashboard Group: Regional cooperation
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Unit not dedicated to evaluation		—
	2	Reporting line		3/3	▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	D-2		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		6/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.33		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.40%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.38		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.45%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	9		▲
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	7/7		▲
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		20%	▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		60%	▲
	13	Gender in reports		100%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		20%	▼

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 9 evaluation reports, 5 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime are to enhance the response of Member States to the intertwined problems of drug use, trafficking, global crime and terrorism by helping create and strengthen legislative, judicial and health systems to safeguard the most vulnerable persons in our society. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 13.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Stand-alone evaluation unit; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.36% of total programme budget.
- 44% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Designed and execute a National Evaluation Capacity pilot experience in Morocco.
- Undertook an OECD DAC/UNEG peer review exercise.
- Produced a Meta Synthesis of all available recommendations of evaluation reports.
- Co-chairing the Decentralization Evaluation Group of UNEG.
- Expanded the donor base to finance the evaluation function services and products.
- New evaluation policy issued and endorsed.
- Communication and advocacy of evaluation specific line of worked created (internal and external).
- Organisation of CND and CCPCJ events on evaluation, accountability and learning.
- Internal advocacy of the evaluation function.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Integrated gender expertise in all corporate evaluations.
- Improved in UN-Women SWAP indicator in evaluation in gender.
- Increased to full coverage of evaluation to organization portfolio.
- Improved the quality assurance system of decentralized evaluations.
- Increased the credibility of the unit by self-volunteering to the scrutiny of a Peer Review.
- Improved coordination and synergies with OIOS audit services.
- Improved the quality and relevance of evaluation normative products and evaluation templates.
- Increase reliability and amount of services through the on-line evaluation application for UNODC evaluations.
- Introduced an independent external quality assurance exercise for all evaluation reports annually.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Stand-alone evaluation unit		—
	2	Reporting line		3/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	▲
	5	Procedures in use (#)		6/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	3.88		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.54%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	2.58		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.36%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	46		▲
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	7/10		▼
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	44%		▼
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')	89%		▲
	13	Gender in reports	67%		▲
	14	Human rights in reports	67%		▲

Notes:

Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 46 evaluation reports, 9 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) is to strengthen the achievement of gender equality and the advancement of women, including women's full enjoyment of their human rights. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, page 261).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Stand-alone evaluation unit; most senior evaluation professional was at D-1 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.44% of total programme budget.
- 80% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Stand-alone evaluation unit		—
	2	Reporting line		3/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	D-1		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		6/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	3.61		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.67%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	2.37		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.44%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	41		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	2/2		—
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	80%		▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')	90%		▲
	13	Gender in reports	100%		—
	14	Human rights in reports	50%		▼

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 41 evaluation reports, 10 were sampled for quality assessment.

The entity notes that some evaluation resources, including voluntary contributions, are not captured in Form 12 or Proposed Programme Budget. Indicator 8 a does not capture staff work months in the decentralized evaluation function. Indicator 10 is not applicable to their work. Total programme budget as reported in the Proposed Programme Fascicle under-represents the total revenue of the entity. Expenditure on evaluation in 2014 was \$5,917,163 and \$6,272,545 in 2015 (UNW/2016/5).

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) are to: (1) increase access to urban land, adoption of enabling urban legislation and establishment of decentralized governance that foster equitable sustainable urban development, (2) improve policies, plans and designs for more compact, socially inclusive, better integrated and connected cities, (3) improve urban strategies and policies that are supportive of inclusive economic development, creation of decent jobs and livelihoods and enhanced municipal finance, (4) increase equitable access to urban basic services and improve the standard of living of the urban poor, (5) increase access to adequate housing and improve the standard of living in existing slums, (6) increase the resilience of cities to the impacts of natural and human-made crises and (7) improve knowledge on sustainable urbanization issues and capacity for formulation and implementation of evidence-based policies. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, pages 208- 218).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Stand-alone evaluation unit; most senior evaluation professional was at P-5 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.17% of total programme budget.
- 75% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Conducting annual evaluation survey to determine use of evaluations in decision-making, learning, accountability and overall organizational performance.
- Following –up the implementation of evaluation recommendations using Evaluation Recommendation Tracking System as well as preparing evaluation briefs as a strategy to increase uptake of UN-Habitat Evaluations by different users.
- Capacity building/training in evaluation, especially for staff involved in project/programme planning, implementation and reporting and presenting evaluation findings, management responses and action plans to UN-Habitat Senior Management with the aim of increasing buy-in to evaluations.
- Involvement in OIOS, UNEG and MOPAN activities.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Revised Evaluation Framework and Executive Directive of January 2016, which directed that all projects and programmes should have evaluation budgets before they approved for implementation.
- Participating in Programme Advisory Group (PAG) meeting, in an advisory role, to ensure appropriate resources are budgeted for evaluations, giving guidance on the development of theories of change, monitoring and evaluation frameworks.
- Emphasising the use of Theory of Change or impact pathways in UN-Habitat evaluations as well as the use of evaluation findings, recommendations and lessons learned in planning new projects and implementing the on-going projects.
- Produced UN-Habitat Evaluation Manual (2017) to detail steps in evaluation processes: planning, managing, conducting, reporting, and evaluation use and follow-up. The primary audience is UN-Habitat staff and consultants who manage and conduct evaluations. In addition, UN-Habitat produced a guidance template for conducting self –evaluations (2016) and provided training of Evaluation Focal Points at the Branch and Regional Office levels.
- More focus on evaluation of global programmes and subprogrammes. Currently the UN-Habitat Strategic Plan 2014-2017 is being evaluated. Also the evaluation of Subprogramme 2: Urban Planning and Design is on-going.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Stand-alone evaluation unit		—
	2	Reporting line		3/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-5		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		4/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	3.11		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.79%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.68		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.17%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	8		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	7/7		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		75%	▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		50%	▼
	13	Gender in reports		75%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		50%	▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 8 evaluation reports, 4 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

**United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015**

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the United Nations Environment Programme are centred on the catalysation of a transition to low-carbon, resource-efficient and equitable development based on the protection and sustainable use of ecosystem services, coherent and improved environmental governance and the reduction of environmental risks. The aim is to contribute to the well-being of current and future generations and the attainment of global environmental goals. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 11.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Stand-alone evaluation unit; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at D-1 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.52% of total programme budget.
- 27% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

None reported.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Revised, updated and formally approved UN Environment Evaluation Policy (March 2016), addresses requirements of new UNEG N&S, and covers all requirements of JIU and OIOS assessment rubrics.
- Updated and upgraded Evaluation Office website (all evaluation reports searchable)
<http://web.unep.org/evaluation/>
- Revised evaluation ToRs and guidance for evaluation consultants and evaluation managers, including use of ToC in evaluation (and how it informs multiple evaluation criteria)
<http://web.unep.org/evaluation/working-us/theory-change>
- Updated framework compiling lessons learned and recommendations across evaluations in a visual map.
- Introduced a weighted ratings rubric across all standard evaluation criteria.
- Quality of all UN Environment evaluation reports assessed externally by independent evaluator.
- All UN Environment evaluation reports externally assessed against gender SWAP criteria.
- MOPAN assessment of UN Environment (2017) stated “Independent evaluation function and quality assurance systems operate effectively and well regarded in recent external assessments”.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development 2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Stand-alone evaluation unit		—
	2	Reporting line		3/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	D-1		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		6/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	2.70		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.44%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	3.22		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.52%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	52		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	7/7		—
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		27%	▼
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		73%	▲
	13	Gender in reports		82%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		9%	▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 52 evaluation reports, 11 were sampled for quality assessment.

Evaluation resources including environment fund and project budgets for evaluation are not captured in Form 12 or Proposed Programme Budget.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

International Trade Centre (ITC)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the International Trade Centre is to assist developing countries, especially least developed countries, and countries with economies in transition in integrating beneficially into the global economy in support of inclusive and sustainable growth and development. In addition, ITC's objective is to foster sustainable economic development and contribute to achieving the Millennium Development Goals in the developing and transition economies through trade and international business development. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 10.1 and page 180).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-4 level.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.5% of total programme budget.
- 67% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Update of the ITC Evaluation Policy (2015); Client Survey (2015)
- Annual Evaluation Synthesis Reports of the Performance of ITC Programmes and Functions, including implementation follow-up of recommendations from past evaluations ('14 and '15).
- Technical Papers: Impact at the Agency Level ITC 's Impact Survey (2014); and an Analysis of Results Measurement and Assessment Tools Applied in ITC (2015).
- Provision of Advisory Services to ITC including the design of evaluation plans etc.
- Presenting Evaluation issues to ITC Governance meetings: Joint Advisory Group (JAG) and the Consultative Committee of the ITC Trust Fund (CCITF) (2014 and 2015).
- Acting as the ITC focal point for all JIU activities, and OIOS Evaluation activities.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- OECD-DAC/UNEG Professional peer review of the ITC evaluation function, June 2016.
- Further operationalize the Evaluation Policy approach, strengthen the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), and its interaction with the design and management functions of ITC.
- IEU now deploys three-tier coverage with a combination of independent evaluations, self-evaluations, and Project Completion Reports (PCR).
- In line with the annual evaluation work plan: launch of the first corporate-level strategic evaluation; implementation of a system for conducting good self-evaluations; and proliferation of an end-of-project self-performance assessment using PCR.
- Develop an online learning course for ITC staff on monitoring and evaluation (in 2017).
- Launch the revision of the ITC Evaluation Guidelines (completion in 2017).
- Presenting Evaluation issues to ITC Governance meetings: JAG and CCITF (2016 and 2017).
- Annual Evaluation Synthesis Reports (2016 and 2017).

International Trade Centre (ITC)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		▲
	2	Reporting line		1/3	▬
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-4		NEW
	4	Policy score		19/19	▲
	5	Procedures in use (#)		4/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		8/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	2.26		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	1.25%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.90		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.50%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	4		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	6/6		▬
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		67%	▲
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		100%	▲
	13	Gender in reports		100%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		0%	▬

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 4 evaluation reports, 3 were sampled for quality assessment.

Total programme budget for ITC was obtained from: A/71/5 (Vol. III), Page 36/90

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development is to assist developing countries, especially least developed countries, and countries with economies in transition in integrating beneficially into the global economy in support of inclusive and sustainable growth and development. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 10.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Stand-alone evaluation unit; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-4 level.
- Evaluation policy and plan were in place, while procedures were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.41% of total programme budget.
- 29% of sampled reports were rated good or excellent for their overall quality.










III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- The Evaluation and Monitoring Unit (EMU) shares and disseminates evaluation results through an Annual Synthesis Report, which is presented to the Trade and Development Board's Working Party. These reports summarize key evaluation findings and recommendations of all evaluations conducted in the previous year, and also identify important lessons learned. These reports are also translated into all the official languages of the UN. The Working Party also reviews and approves UNCTAD's annual subprogramme evaluation plan.
- EMU circulates a newsletter as part of an outreach process to build evaluation awareness.
- As part of the Oversight process, EMU reviewed project documents and continuously advocated for evaluation findings and recommendations to be considered in programme planning.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- UNCTAD has developed and implemented an evaluation follow-up mechanism that allows for tracking of evaluation recommendations follow-up.
- In order to further disseminate the main evaluation findings, outcomes and lessons learned and to communicate the work of EMU to a wider audience, EMU now prepares evaluation briefs to accompany all evaluation reports.
- EMU has revised and upgraded its evaluation tools in line with 2016 revised UNEG Norms and Standards to ensure a coherent evaluation approaches and methodologies across UNCTAD.
- Finally, EMU is revising its current Evaluation Policy in line with 2016 revised UNEG Norms and Standards.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Stand-alone evaluation unit		▲
	2	Reporting line		3/3	▬
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-4		NEW
	4	Policy score		17/19	▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		3/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		7/8	▬
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	1.77		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.79%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.92		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	0.41%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	14		▲
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	5/5		▲
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		29%	▼
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		14%	▼
	13	Gender in reports		71%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		0%	▬

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 14 evaluation reports, 7 were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (OOSA)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Office for Outer Space Affairs is to promote international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space for economic, social and scientific development, in particular for the benefit of developing countries. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 5.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation but evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff were reported.
- Evaluation policy partially in place; procedures and plan were absent.
- No evaluation reports were submitted to OIOS for review.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Distribution of questionnaires to beneficiaries of the Office's capacity building activities.
- Recording of lessons learned in all back-to-Office mission reports.
- Weekly assessment, at management level, of progress and challenges faced in implementation of programme deliverables.
- Quarterly monitoring and recording of output delivery and performance measures.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Institution of debriefing sessions, at management level as well as within respective implementation/tasks team, on principle or strategic activities with a view to incorporating lessons learned and integrating improvements, strategic re-directions and other programme developments directly impacting on programme outputs.
- Initiation of review of existing evaluation strategy, including comparison to other evaluation frameworks to identify need for revision.
- Efforts to integrate evaluation, and cost for, in new extra-budgetary funding proposals.
- Implementation, together with support from relevant donor, of an evaluation exercise of the impact of one segment of a programme of the Office.

United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (OOSA)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		▲
	2	Reporting line		0/3	▬
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score		7/19	▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		0/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		0/8	▼
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.49		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget		5.11%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget		N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	13	Gender in reports		N/A	N/A
	14	Human rights in reports		N/A	N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, and Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States are to mobilize and coordinate international support and resources for the effective implementation of: (i) the Istanbul Programme of Action; (ii) the outcome of the 10-year review of the Almaty Programme of Action; and (iii) the Mauritius Strategy; enhance monitoring and follow-up to the three programmes of action; raise awareness and advocacy with respect to the three groups of countries (least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States) and their respective programmes of action; and report on the implementation of the Programmes of Action as effective tools for reaching the international development goals of the countries concerned. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 8.2).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation unit but some evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff were reported.
- Evaluation policy was partially in place; procedures and plan were not in use.
- No reports were submitted for OIOS document review.





III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- OHRLLS regularly organized structured discussions among staff members, and Senior Management, on lessons learnt, impact, effectiveness and efficiency of the activities.
- OHRLLS led the preparation of the Secretary General Reports on the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011-2020 and the Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Landlocked Developed Countries for the Decade 2014-2024.
- OHRLLS also contributed to the UN-Secretariat wide programme performance review.
- As a member of the Senior Management Group, the High Representative signed compacts for 2014 and 2015, in which he committed to achieving the programme objectives and deliver expected results, as mandated by the GA. All these compacts were reviewed.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- OHRLLS organized a workshop for all staff members on using evaluation entitled: “Learning from experience: evaluation as a planning instrument for programme delivery” Techniques learned during the workshop will be used in OHRLLS’s assessment exercises.
- OHRLLS organizes lessons learnt sessions after major activities of the office. Lessons learnt are then included as part of the formulation of the programme budget.
- OHRLLS distributes evaluation questionnaires after every major regional meeting to assess level of satisfaction and relevance of activities with stakeholders. The findings of the questionnaires have informed changes in ways in which activities are carried out.

Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line		1/3	▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score		11/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)			NEW
	6	Plan score			—
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.29		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	1.91%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	13	Gender in reports			N/A
	14	Human rights in reports			N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa are to mobilize support and galvanize the efforts of the international community for peace and development in Africa; ensure that the development of Africa remains one of the main priorities of the international community; promote a supportive international framework for African development efforts; encourage a coordinated and effective response by the United Nations system at the policy and operational levels in support of African development; and strengthen and enhance South-South cooperation in support of Africa's advancement. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 9.6).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation unit but evaluation activity reported; no centralized evaluation staff reported.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were not in use.
- No reports were submitted to OIOS for review.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- The Under-Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Africa signed Senior Manager's compacts in 2014 and 2015 respectively, in which he committed to achieving the programme objectives and deliver expected results contained in the programme budget 2014-2015, as mandated by the United Nations General Assembly. Both in 2014 and 2015, performance of the Special Adviser was evaluated by OSAA and the Department of Management and provided to the Executive Office of the Secretary General. These performance reviews were also published and made public on the UN intranet.
- OSAA provided inputs on the implementation of its programme to the Department of Management through the Integrated Management and Document Information System (IMDIS) and drafted the Programme Performance Review for OSAA in biennium 2014-2015.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- OSAA adopted the Policy Statement on Self-Evaluation in January 2016.

Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line			▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score			—
	5	Procedures in use (#)			NEW
	6	Plan score			—
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.15		N/A
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%		N/A
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%		NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		—
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	13	Gender in reports			N/A
	14	Human rights in reports			N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs is to promote and support international cooperation in the pursuit of sustained economic growth, the eradication of poverty and hunger, and sustainable development for all. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 7.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation unit but evaluation activity takes place; no centralized evaluation professional reported.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted 0.05% of total programme budget.
- None of the sampled reports were rated as good or excellent for their overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- DESA produced an evaluation implementation guide in December 2015 for evaluation capacity building for DESA staff. The guide is to assist DESA staff in carrying out their responsibilities in the management and oversight of sub-programme evaluations.
- DESA produced a project evaluation guidelines, overseen by its Capacity Development Office;
- Improved consolidation of evaluation plans.
- Strengthened evaluation reports submission.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Updated the Department's Evaluation Policy.
- Strengthened role of the Departmental network of evaluation focal points.
- Ensured that gender equality is represented in its evaluation work. This is specifically included in the Department's evaluation implementation guide... "In line with GA mandates and UNEG Norms and Standards, DESA will strive to integrate gender equality throughout different steps of the self-evaluation cycle, including ensuring: evaluation teams are balanced on gender; mapping stakeholders with a view to gender equality considerations; reflecting any gender specific aspects of the sub-programme; ensuring appropriate questions are included in the planning process; and collecting disaggregated data for analysis" (DESA Evaluation Implementation Guide, p. 6).

Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)
Dashboard Group: Norm setting and development
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line			3/3 ▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score			14/19 —
	5	Procedures in use (#)			3/6 NEW
	6	Plan score			7/8 ▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.09		▼
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.03%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.15		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.05%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	7		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	6/9		▼
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	0%		▼
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')			25% ▼
	13	Gender in reports			25% ▲
	14	Human rights in reports			25% ▲

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Out of 7 evaluation reports, 3 were sampled for quality assessment. The entity has noted that sampled reports for this assessment do not reflect evaluations undertaken under DESA's substantive programme of work (Section 9). The sampled reports reflected herein are for projects implemented under the Development Account (Section 35) and the Regular Programme of Technical Cooperation (Section 23). The evaluation resources identified in Form 12 pertain only to DESA's substantive programme of work under Section 9 of the biennial programme budget.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Department of Management (DM)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the Department of Management (DM) are to enhance the accountability and efficiency of the Organization in managing its resources in four broad management areas, namely, finance, human resources, information and communications technology (ICT), and support services, including procurement and infrastructure; to provide support services to the intergovernmental processes of the Organization; to secure financing for the mandated programmes and activities of the Secretariat; and to support the implementation of those programmes and activities. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 25.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation unit but evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff reported.
- Evaluation policy and procedures in place; evaluation plan was not in use.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.01% of total programme budget.
- None of the sampled reports were rated good or excellent for overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

Department of Management (DM)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line	3/3		▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score	13/19		—
	5	Procedures in use (#)	4/6		NEW
	6	Plan score	0/8		▼
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	5.89		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.66%		▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.09		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.01%		NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	2		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	2/5		▲
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	0%		—
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')	100%		—
	13	Gender in reports	0%		—
	14	Human rights in reports	0%		—

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: Both evaluation reports were sampled for quality assessment.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Department of Public Information (DPI)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Department of Public Information is to promote global awareness and enhanced understanding of the work and issues of the United Nations by providing accurate, impartial, comprehensive, balanced, coherent, timely and relevant information. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 24.2).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Stand-alone evaluation unit; most senior centralized evaluation professional was P-4.
- Evaluation policy was not in place; procedures and plan were partially in place.
- Expenditure on evaluation reports constituted around 0.21% of total programme budget.
- Sampled report was not rated as good or excellent in terms of overall quality.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- Analysis of global news media and social media coverage of the Millennium Development Goals/Post-2015 Development Agenda communications activities.
- Analysis of global news media coverage of the UN's response to Ebola at the request of the Ebola Response Team.
- Assessment of the Department's broadcast partnerships in the 6 official UN languages, as requested by the Committee on Information.
- Assessment of the "Turn the World UN Blue" campaign and the communications activities to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the United Nations.
- DPI participated in a Peer Learning Exchange on integrating gender and human rights into evaluations.
- The International Public Relations Association (IPRA) Advisory Group for Evaluation held a capacity development workshop for DPI managers and staff on industry standards for measuring the outcome and impact of communications work.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- The Department's evaluation policy came into force with formal approval by the Under-Secretary General in January 2016. DPI's evaluation policy provides a formal framework for the Department's ongoing evaluation function.
- The Strategy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women 2016-2019 came into force in January 2016. The strategy is based on the UN System Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNSWAP), and ensures that monitoring, evaluation, and reporting mechanisms adhere to UN Evaluation Group's norms and standards, as well as the UNSWAP Technical Note.
- Evaluation reports are now publicly made available, including on the UN Evaluation Group's website.

**Department of Public Information (DPI)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015**

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Stand-alone evaluation unit		▲
	2	Reporting line		3/3	▬
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-4		NEW
	4	Policy score		0/19	▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		6/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		3/8	▬
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	4.56		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	2.31%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)	0.41		NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	0.21%	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	1		▬
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	2/3		▲
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		0%	▬
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		0%	▬
	13	Gender in reports		100%	▲
	14	Human rights in reports		0%	▬

Notes: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

*Quality of Reports: The one screened evaluation report was also assessed for quality assessment.

DPI report that Form 12 erroneously recorded their monitoring and evaluation resources for the 2014-2015 biennium; the corrected resources figure was \$1.14 million (as published in A/68/6 para 28.14). Correspondingly, indicator 7b (monitoring and evaluation budget as a percentage of total programme budget) was 0.61% for the biennium.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Department for General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM) are to facilitate the orderly and effective conduct of the deliberations and follow-up actions of intergovernmental bodies and conferences; to provide substantive and technical secretariat servicing to the Committee on Conferences; to ensure the provision of high-quality conference-servicing support; to provide protocol, liaison and representational functions for the Secretary-General; and to ensure the uninterrupted delivery of services during the implementation of the capital master plan at Headquarters. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 1.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:






- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; most senior centralized evaluation professional was at P-4 level.
- Evaluation policy not in place; procedures and plan were weak.
- No evaluation reports were screened by OIOS.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- DGACM developed and implemented an evaluation policy in 2016 across the 4 duty stations.
- In 2016, DGACM developed (i) a Monitoring Plan, (ii) an Evaluation Plan, (iii) a standardized Evaluation Template (to be used across all duty stations and to supplement the Evaluation Plan), and (iv) Roadmap to track and monitor the implementation of recommendations on performance evaluation and KPIs for the Department across the 4 duty stations, under the purview of the Departmental Steering Group.
- Departmental tracking and monitoring is conducted using the gData dashboard and reports.
- DGACM staff members with Evaluation, Analysis and Monitoring functions at the 4 duty stations are working collaboratively on standardized implementation of Stream II recommendations. The evaluations are shared amongst the duty stations to ensure they are within agreed parameters.
- Evaluation results are fed back into programme planning. Evaluation reports are shared with Departmental senior and line-managers for review and are used to inform their decision making process and future programme planning & implementation.

Department for General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		▲
	2	Reporting line		1/3	▬
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional	P-4		NEW
	4	Policy score			▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		1/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		2/8	▲
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	3.65		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.51%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		▼
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	13	Gender in reports			N/A
	14	Human rights in reports			N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Department of Safety and Security (DSS)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the Department of Safety and Security is: to enable the effective conduct of United Nations activities by ensuring a coherent, effective and timely response to all security-related threats and other emergencies; to ensure effective risk mitigation through the establishment of a coordinated security threat and risk assessment mechanism in the framework of a common system wide methodology; and to develop high-quality best-practice security policies, standards and operational procedures across the United Nations system and to support their implementation and monitor compliance. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 28.2).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division; no centralized evaluation staff were reported.
- Evaluation policy and procedures were partially in place; evaluation plan was not in use.
- No evaluation reports were screened by OIOS.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- Development of an Evaluation Work plan for the biennium.
- Acceptance of Evaluation concept as Policy document.
- Three evaluations of the Security Programme undertaken and completed: El Salvador, Uganda and Turkey.
- Procedures established for factoring gender in evaluations.
- Development of templates for ensuring quality assurance of evaluation reports and capturing lessons learned during evaluations.
- Procedures established for monitoring evaluation recommendations and disseminating evaluation reports.
- Enhancement of staff competencies through professional evaluation training.

**Department of Safety and Security (DSS)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015**

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division		▲
	2	Reporting line	3/3		▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score	14/19		▲
	5	Procedures in use (#)	3/6		NEW
	6	Plan score	0/8		▬
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	2.58		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%		▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%		NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		▬
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')	N/A		N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')	N/A		N/A
	13	Gender in reports	N/A		N/A
	14	Human rights in reports	N/A		N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the United Nations Office at Geneva are to: ensure sound, effective and efficient financial management of United Nations assets; promote organizational culture change in order to address new requirements and needs; ensure the effective and efficient functioning of the United Nations Office at Geneva with regard to office and conference facilities management, asset management, travel and transportation, mail and pouch services and commercial activities; ensure the efficient, effective and transparent achievement of the operational goals of the Organization by leveraging information and communications technology; and build past, present and future collective recorded knowledge of the United Nations and of related external resources. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, p. 561).





II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation unit but evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff reported.
- Evaluation policy and plan were not in use; some procedures were in use.
- No evaluation reports were screened by OIOS.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		▲
	2	Reporting line		1/3	▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score			▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		3/6	NEW
	6	Plan score			▬
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.84		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	 0.85%	0.42%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	 0.5%	N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		▬
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')			N/A
	13	Gender in reports			N/A
	14	Human rights in reports			N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

Office of Legal Affairs (OLA)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objective of the Office of Legal Affairs is to support the accomplishment of the objectives of the United Nations by providing advice to the principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations and by promoting among Member States a better understanding of and respect for the principles and norms of international law. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, para. 6.1).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- No evaluation unit but evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff reported.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were not in use.
- No evaluation reports were screened by OIOS.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

- OLA units regularly organized structured discussions among staff members, with the presence of Senior Management, aimed at discussing lessons learnt, impact and effectiveness and efficiency.
- The following evaluation activities were disseminated to Senior Management and assessed levels of satisfaction and relevance of activities for stakeholders. Findings have informed the way in which activities are carried out so that they have maximum impact:
 - Codification Division: Survey on the substantive and technical servicing of the 6th Committee and the International Law Commission and surveys on the courses offered under the Programme of Assistance.
 - Division on Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea: Periodic assessment of performance of the subprogramme includes an evaluation of available resources to carry out mandated activities and identification of activities to address any shortcomings.
 - International Trade Law Division: Surveys on the substantive and technical servicing of UNCITRAL and its Working Groups. Assessment of the relevance of activities through tracking of treaty ratifications and collecting feedback from staff missions that inform future follow-up actions.

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

- OLA is currently finalizing its Evaluation Policy to be in line with UNEG Norms and Standards.
- Drafted an Evaluation Report Template which will take into account the Compendium of Best Practices 2016.
- OLA is finalizing its Evaluation Workplan which will take into account the 8 criteria measuring aspects of an evaluation plan as presented by OIOS.
- OLA is in appointing Evaluation Focal Points in each of the 6 OLA units.
- OLA is developing a system tracking evaluation findings and implementation of recommendations.
- OLA is awaiting OIOS's response on its request for a "train the trainers' session" so that its Evaluation Focal Points are adequately trained in preparing evaluation reports.
- OLA is currently working on preparing an Evaluation Report for a sub-programme for the Biennium 2016-2017.

Office of Legal Affairs (OLA)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	No evaluation unit but evaluation activity		▲
	2	Reporting line		3/3	▲
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score		0/19	▬
	5	Procedures in use (#)		0/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		0/8	▬
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.60		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.92%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		▬
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	13	Gender in reports		N/A	N/A
	14	Human rights in reports		N/A	N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the United Nations Office at Vienna are to: ensure sound, effective and efficient financial management of United Nations assets; promote organizational culture change in order to address new requirements and needs; ensure the efficient and effective functioning of the United Nations Office at Vienna, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and affiliated entities with regard to office and conference facilities management, asset management, travel and transportation, archives and records management, mail and pouch services and commercial activities; and facilitate the achievement of the operational goals of the Organization through information and communications technology. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, p. 566).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Minimal or no evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff reported.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were not in use.
- No reports were submitted to OIOS for review.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Minimal or no evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line		0/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score		0/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		0/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		0/8	—
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.54		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.84%	▼
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		—
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	13	Gender in reports		N/A	N/A
	14	Human rights in reports		N/A	N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

I. Entity objective:

The overall objectives of the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) are to: ensure sound, effective and efficient financial management of United Nations assets under the purview of the United Nations Office at Nairobi, support client departments in achieving their strategic objectives by providing them with efficient and effective human resources management services; enable the effective and efficient functioning of the United Nations Office at Nairobi with regard to office and conference facilities management, asset management, travel and transportation, archives and records management, mail and pouch services, and commercial activities; and ensure the efficient, effective and transparent achievement of the functional and operational goals of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) and the United Nations Office at Nairobi by leveraging information and communication technology. (A/67/6/Rev. 1, p. 570).

II. Key features of evaluation in 2014-2015:

- Minimal or no evaluation activity; no centralized evaluation staff reported.
- Evaluation policy, procedures and plan were not in use.
- No reports were submitted to OIOS for review.

III. Other evaluation activities (not resulting in evaluation reports) undertaken during 2014-2015 (self-reported):

IV. Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium (self-reported):

United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)
Dashboard Group: Management and support
2014-2015

	INDICATOR		STATUS		CHANGES SINCE 2012-2013
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	1	Type of function	Minimal or no evaluation activity		—
	2	Reporting line		0/3	—
	3	Level of senior-most evaluation professional			NEW
	4	Policy score		0/19	—
	5	Procedures in use (#)		0/6	NEW
	6	Plan score		0/8	—
RESOURCES	7a	Monitoring and evaluation budget (\$m)	0.31		▲
	7b	M&E as % of total programme budget	0.85%	0.52%	▲
EVALUATION REPORTS*	8a	Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m)			NEW
	8b	Expenditure on reports as % of total programme budget	0.5%	N/A	NEW
	9	Evaluation reports (#)	0		—
	10	Subprogrammes referenced by reports (#)	N/A		N/A
QUALITY OF REPORTS*	11	Report quality (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	12	Recommendations (% 'good' or 'excellent')		N/A	N/A
	13	Gender in reports		N/A	N/A
	14	Human rights in reports		N/A	N/A

Note: Secretariat averages for indicators 7a and 8a are \$1.8 million and \$0.63 million, respectively.

Colour Codes	Indicators				
	2	4	5	6	11-14
Low	0-1	0-5	0-1	0-2	0%-32%
Medium	2	6-12	2-3	3-5	33%-66%
High	3	13-19	4-6	6-8	67%-100%

PART III
ANNEXES

Annex I. List of entities included in the report

1. Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA)
2. Department of Field Support (DFS)
3. Department for General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM)
4. Department of Management (DM)
5. Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)
6. Department of Political Affairs (DPA)
7. Department of Public Information (DPI)
8. Department of Safety and Security (DSS)
9. Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)
10. Economic Commission for Europe (ECE)
11. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)
12. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)
13. Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)
14. International Trade Centre (ITC)
15. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
16. Office for Disarmament Affairs (ODA)
17. Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS)
18. Office of Legal Affairs (OLA)
19. Office for Outer Space Affairs (OOSA)
20. Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA)
21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
22. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
23. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
24. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women)
25. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
26. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)
27. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
28. United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)
29. United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)
30. United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV)
31. United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

Annex II. Description of indicators and data sources

Sixteen indicators on evaluation framework, resources, reports and quality of reports are included in the Dashboard. These indicators reflect the necessary building blocks of a strong evaluation function. This section describes each indicator, lists the source of data for each, and notes the UNEG Norms and Standards to which each indicator relates. Please note that all data relate to the 2014-2015 biennium.

A. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

1. Type of function

The UNEG norm for independence (N4) states that independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility; it influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process. Central evaluation function should be positioned “independently from management functions, carries the responsibility of setting the evaluation agenda and is provided with adequate resources to conduct its work.” The UNEG norm for credibility (N3) underscores that “credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology.” In addition, the UNEG norm for responsibility for evaluation (N13) highlights the responsibility of an organization’s governing body and/or executive head in “ensuring the establishment of a duly independent, competent and adequately resourced evaluation function to serve its governance and management needs.”

Type of evaluation function refers to the structure of centralized evaluation function within the entity:

- 4 – Stand-alone evaluation unit
- 3 – Dedicated evaluation unit within a multifunctional division
- 2 – Unit not dedicated to evaluation (includes other activities within a multifunctional division)
- 1 – No evaluation unit but evaluation activity
- 0 – Minimal or no evaluation activity

Data source: Focal points survey conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

2. Reporting line

The UNEG norm for independence (N4) states that evaluation managers should “have full discretion to directly submit evaluation reports to the appropriate level of decision-making and that they should report directly to an organization’s governing body and/or the executive head.” Particularly, the UN standard for institutional framework (1.1) requires that “the evaluation function is independent of other management functions in order to facilitate an independent and impartial evaluation process. The head of evaluation should report directly to the governing body and/or the executive head of the organization.”

The extent to which the evaluation function has an independent reporting line:

- 3 – Evaluation function reports to the governing body and/or the head of the entity
- 2 – Evaluation function reports to an independent oversight function
- 1 – Evaluation function reports to another management function
- 0 – Evaluation function has no clear reporting line or no evaluation function exists

Source: Focal points survey conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

3. Seniority

The staffing level of the senior-most member of the centralized evaluation function or the senior-most member responsible for evaluation:

- 4 – Senior-most member of the centralized evaluation function a D-2
- 3 – Senior-most member of the centralized evaluation function a D-1
- 2 – Senior-most member of the centralized evaluation function a P-5
- 1 – Senior-most member of the centralized evaluation function a P-4

Data source: Focal points survey conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

4. Policy score

The UNEG norm on policy (N12) states that “every organization should establish an explicit evaluation policy. Taking into account the specificities of the organization’s requirements, the evaluation policy should include a clear explanation of the purpose, concepts, rules and use of evaluation within the organization; the institutional framework and roles and responsibilities; measures to safeguard evaluation independence and public accountability; benchmarks for financing the evaluation function that are commensurate with the size and function of the organization; measures to ensure the quality and the use of evaluations and post-evaluation follow-up; a framework for decentralized evaluations, where applicable; and provision for periodic peer review or external assessment.” The UNEG standard for institutional framework (Standard 1.2) indicates that “organizations should establish an evaluation policy that is periodically reviewed and updated in order to support the evaluation function’s increased adherence to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation.”

Evaluation policy adherence to the following 19 criteria (based on the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System):

- i. Does the policy clearly state how the entity defines evaluation?
- ii. Is the purpose of the evaluation function clearly stated?
- iii. Is the purpose stated for accountability?
- iv. Is the purpose stated for learning?
- v. Are evaluation standards such as utility, credibility and independence discussed?
- vi. Is the function independent?
- vii. Does the policy indicate reporting lines?
- viii. Does the policy state what are the competencies required for evaluators?
- ix. Does the policy state the general criteria for selecting evaluations?
- x. Does the policy state how evaluations are planned?
- xi. Does the policy state who will manage evaluations?
- xii. Does the policy state how participatory the evaluation process will be?
- xiii. Does the policy state how results will be followed up on?
- xiv. Does the policy state how evaluation results will feed into org learning/knowledge management systems?
- xv. Does the policy state who will decide if recommendations are accepted or not?
- xvi. Does the policy indicate the disclosure parameters?
- xvii. Does the policy state how evaluations will be disseminated?
- xviii. Does the policy promote gender equality?
- xix. Does the policy promote human rights?

Data source: Document review conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

5. Procedures in use (#)

The UNEG norm on evaluation use and follow up (N14) underscores that “management should integrate evaluation results and recommendations into its policies and programmes” as well as systematically follow up on the implementation of evaluation recommendations. The UNEG standard for institutional framework (Standard 1.4) states that “the organization should ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in

place to ensure that management responds to evaluation recommendations. The mechanisms should outline concrete actions to be undertaken in the management response and in the follow-up to recommendation implementation.” In addition, the UNEG standard for conduct of evaluations (Standard 4.11) indicates that “evaluation functions should have an effective strategy for communication and dissemination that is focused on enhancing evaluation use.”

The number of procedures in use (out of the following 6 procedures recommended by OIOS in A/70/72):

- i. Developing an evaluation work plan
- ii. Developing action plans for implementing evaluation recommendations
- iii. Tracking and/or monitoring the implementation of evaluation recommendations
- iv. Sharing and/or disseminating evaluation reports
- v. Sharing and/or disseminating lessons learned from the evaluation
- vi. Feeding evaluation results back into programme planning and implementation

Data source: Document review conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

6. Plan score

The UNEG standard for institutional framework for evaluation (Standard 1.3) states that “the evaluation plan should be based on an explicit evaluation policy and/or strategy, prepared with utility and practicality in mind and developed with a clear purpose, scope and intended use for each evaluation (or each cluster of evaluations).” Likewise, the UNEG standard for timeliness and intentionality (Standard 4.1) states that the rationale for conducting an evaluation should be clear from the outset. The evaluation plan, scope and design should be determined with a view to generating the most relevant, useful and timely information that will meet the needs of intended users and will be relevant to decision-making processes. Furthermore, Rule 107.2(a) of the PPBME states that “all programmes shall be evaluated on a regular, periodic basis. At the programme and sub programme level, evaluation plans shall be linked to the medium-term plan, and they shall be integrated with the programme budget cycle.”

Evaluation plan adherence to the following eight criteria:

- i. Are the types of planned evaluations clear?
- ii. Does the plan state the purpose of the evaluations?
- iii. Does the plan state who will conduct the evaluation?
- iv. Does the plan specify who is responsible for the evaluations?
- v. Does the plan specify resources for the evaluations?
- vi. Does the plan state target dates for the evaluations?
- vii. Does the entity have a formal procedure for developing evaluation plans?
- viii. Is the plan submitted to the head of the entity or governing body for review/approval?

Data source: Document review conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

B. RESOURCES

The UNEG norm on enabling environment (N11) states that “creating an enabling environment also entails providing predictable and adequate resources to the evaluation function.” Similarly, the UNEG standard for institutional framework for evaluation (Standard 1.2) highlights that “the evaluation policy should include a clear explanation of the Benchmarks to ensure that evaluation function resources are commensurate with the size and function of the organization; resources for the evaluation function should allow for the conduct of high-quality evaluation activities to meet organizational needs for learning and accountability.”

7a. Monitoring & evaluation budget (\$m)

Monitoring and evaluation budget allocation.

Data source: Monitoring and evaluation resources noted in individual Proposed Programme Budgets (A/68/6) and/or Form 12.

7b. M&E as a % of total programme budget

Monitoring and evaluation budget allocation as a per cent of total programme budget. UN secretariat wide average (0.85%) is shown as a vertical blue bar. The length of the bar denotes the maximum of the observed values for this indicator, 5.11%.

Data source: Survey of screened reports, conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72) and total programme budget data in individual Proposed Programme Budgets (A/71/5 in the case of ITC; A/68/6 for all other entities).

C. EVALUATION REPORTS

8a. Expenditure on evaluation reports (\$m):

The UNEG standard for institutional framework for evaluation (Standard 1.2) states that “in determining the range of funding for evaluation, small organizations will generally need to spend more in relative terms than larger organizations. Factors to be considered when determining the range of funding include the organization’s mandate and size; the types of evaluations to be considered; and the role of the evaluation function in institutionalization and support to strengthening decentralized evaluation, national capacities for evaluation and evaluation partnerships.”

Reported amount spent on screened evaluation reports, including staff work months (converted to dollar amounts using standard staffing costs by location for 2014-2015), consultant costs, and ‘other’ costs.

Data source: Survey of screened reports, conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

8b. Expenditure on reports as a % of total programme budget:

The UNEG standard for institutional framework for evaluation (Standard 1.2) indicates that “with respect to financial benchmarking, the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit (JIU/REP/2014/6) concluded that organizations should consider a range of funding that is between 0.5 per cent and 3.0 per cent of organizational expenditure.”

Expenditure on evaluation reports as a proportion of total programme budget. The red line indicates the lower limit of JIU’s recommendation for expenditure on evaluation (0.5%) while the length of the bar denotes the upper limit of that recommendation (3%).

Data source: Survey of screened reports, conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72) and total programme budget data in individual Proposed Programme Budgets (A/71/5 in the case of ITC; A/68/6 for all other entities).

9. Evaluation reports

The UNEG standard for conduct of evaluations (Standard 4.9) states that “the final evaluation report should be logically structured and contain evidence-based findings, conclusions and recommendations.”

Number of evaluation reports that met the following seven criteria:

- i. Was the report dated between 1/1/2014 and 31/12/2015?
- ii. Was the report authored by OIOS, JIU, BoA or a donor (criterion for exclusion)

- iii. Is the report assessing an element of the Programme’s performance relative to its mandate or goals?
- iv. Does the report include a description of the methodology (defined as data sources, data collection and analysis methods, limitations and underlying analytical assumptions)?
- v. Does the report include a description of the evidence?
- vi. Does the report contain findings and conclusions?
- vii. Does the report include a forward looking element, such as recommendations or a plan of action?

Data source: Screening of reports conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

10. Subprogramme referenced by reports (#)

Rule 107.2(a) of the PPBME states that “all programmes shall be evaluated on a regular, periodic basis” and Rule 107.2(b) states that “programme managers shall, in collaboration with their staff, undertake self-evaluation of all subprogrammes under their responsibility...”

Number of subprogrammes referenced by the screened reports, out of the total number of subprogrammes in the entity.

Note that PPBME regulations do not require complete coverage of all subprogrammes in each biennium. Instead, they require all subprogrammes to be evaluated on an unspecified, “period basis”. This indicator shows coverage in the current biennium to provide information to managers to assist in future planning.

Data source: Screened reports survey conducted for OIOS biennial report (A/72/72)

D. QUALITY OF REPORTS

11. Report quality (% ‘good’ or ‘excellent’)

The UNEG standard for quality (Standard 5.1) states that “Typically invoked at the design and finalization stages of evaluation, an appropriate quality assurance mechanism looks at both the evaluation process and its products.”

Proportion of reports which received ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ for overall quality in the quality assessment of sampled reports.

Data source: Quality assessment of sampled reports⁶

12. Recommendations (% ‘good’ or ‘excellent’)

The UNEG standard for conduct of evaluations (Standard 4.10) states that “recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, clear, results-oriented and realistic in terms of implementation.” It adds that “Recommendations should be clear on who needs to implement them.”

Proportion of reports which received ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ for actionable and/or well-assigned recommendations

Data source: Quality assessment of sampled reports

13. Gender in reports

The UNEG Norm on human rights and gender equality (N8) indicates that “The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an

⁶ Assessment based on a compilation of 30 criteria assessing the executive summary, introduction, methodology, background, results, conclusions, recommendations and format for 100 sampled reports. Annex III includes details on the sampling methodology, and annex IV presents the quality assessment instrument.

evaluation.” The UNEG norm on ethics (N6) states that “evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality.” Furthermore, the UNEG standard for evaluations (Standard 4.7) states that “the evaluation design should include considerations of the extent to which the United Nations system’s commitment to the human-rights based approach and gender mainstreaming strategy was incorporated in the design of the evaluation subject.”

Proportion of reports which had ‘some’ or ‘strong’ evidence of gender considerations in evaluation methodology and results

Data source: Quality assessment of sampled reports

14. Human rights in reports

The UNEG Norm on human rights and gender equality (N8) indicates that “the universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation.” The UNEG norm on ethics (N6) states that “evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality.” Furthermore, the UNEG standard for evaluations (Standard 4.7) states that “the evaluation design should include considerations of the extent to which the United Nations system’s commitment to the human-rights based approach and gender mainstreaming strategy was incorporated in the design of the evaluation subject.”

Proportion of reports which had ‘some’ or ‘strong’ evidence of human rights considerations in evaluation methodology and results

Data source: Quality assessment of sampled reports

Annex III. Methodology for reports review and calculation of financial indicators

OIOS requested evaluation focal points from all 31 secretariat entities to submit reports finalized during the 2013-2014 biennium. OIOS received 446 reports from 25 secretariat entities. The following entities did not submit reports: United Nations Office at Nairobi, United Nations Office at Vienna, Office for Disarmament Affairs, Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, The United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs and the office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States. Submissions from DGACM, DSS, OLA, and UNOG did not meet criteria for evaluation reports. Following a screening process, a total of 273 reports from 21 entities that met the screening⁷ criteria were considered for further assessment.

OIOS used stratified random sampling to identify a total of 100 reports out of the 273 screen reports for quality assessment. The table below presents the strata used to determine the number of reports to be sampled for each entity.

Sampling methodology

Minimum number of reports screened	Percentage sampled
1	100 per cent
2-5	75 per cent
6-15	50 per cent
16-30	33 per cent
31-45	25 per cent
46-53	20 per cent

All 100 reports in the sample were assessed against 30 criteria evaluating each report's executive summary, introduction, methodology, background, results, conclusions, recommendations and format (see annex IV). The review was undertaken by two consultants.

Regarding financial indicators, OIOS used data from individual Proposed Programme Budgets for each entity as well their respective monitoring and evaluation allocations from Form 12. For select entities⁸, where there was a significant mismatch between the data sources, OIOS used updated Form 12 figures as per OPPBA guidance. In addition, OIOS used *screened reports survey* to calculate estimates of expenditures on evaluation reports, broken down across staff work months, consultancy costs and 'other' costs.

OIOS further used JIU's suggested range - between 0.5% and 3% of total programme budget - to illustrate the level of resources in each entity. Entities may consider evaluation funding depending on a range of factors such as the entity's mandate, size, and type of evaluation function.

⁷ Please refer to indicator 9 in Annex I.

⁸ ECE, DSS and DPI

Annex IV. Quality Assessment Sheet

Title of report:

No. of pages (without annexes):

Year of report:

Date of assessment:

Budget (if available):

Type of assessment: Selective

Complete

Programme:

Subprogramme(s) or organizational unit(s):

Priority areas of the UN Secretariat (select all that apply)

- Promotion of sustained economic growth and sustainable development, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and recent United Nations conferences
- Maintenance of international peace and security
- Development of Africa
- Promotion of human rights
- Effective coordination of humanitarian assistance efforts
- Promotion of justice and international law
- Disarmament
- Drug control, crime prevention and combating international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations

Potential to provide baseline data on SDGs (select all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere <input type="checkbox"/> 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries <input type="checkbox"/> 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable <input type="checkbox"/> 12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts <input type="checkbox"/> 14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development <input type="checkbox"/> 15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss <input type="checkbox"/> 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels <input type="checkbox"/> 17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development |
|--|--|

1. Quality screening⁴

Rating scale: 1 = excellent (strong, above average, best practice) 2 = good (satisfactory, respectable) 3 = fair (partly meets quality standard, acceptable) 4 = poor (weak, hardly meets quality standard) 5 = very poor (very weak, missing, completely fails to meet quality standard)

No.	Quality standards	Ratings	Comments
Executive summary			
1.	The executive summary is written as a stand-alone section. It has a clear structure along the key elements of the report, in particular subject, purpose and objectives of the evaluation, methodology, main results, conclusions and recommendations. It is reasonably concise.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Introduction overall: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5			
2.	The report states when the evaluation was conducted (<u>period</u> of the evaluation).	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
3.	The report states upfront by whom the evaluation was conducted (names of evaluators not a requirement).	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
4.	The report clearly specifies the subject of the evaluation (for programmes/projects: intervention logic or theory of change; budget; time frame; implementing partners; implementation modalities, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
5.	The report clearly specifies the <u>purpose</u> and the <u>objectives</u> of the evaluation (ratings “good” or “excellent” requires both purpose and objectives to be specified).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
6.	The report clearly specifies what the evaluation does and does not cover (scope of the evaluation – e.g., time span, geographical coverage).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
7.	The report clearly specifies the key evaluation questions and criteria (if only included in annex give “fair” or “poor” rating).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Methodology overall: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5			

⁴ The overall rating of each section is based on the ratings of the quality standards, but is not a mathematical average, providing the reviewer the flexibility to give some standards more weight if necessary. However, the overall rating for each report is based on a mathematical average of the aggregated ratings from the eight sections, whereby counting the results section double, reflecting the fact that generally the results are the most elaborate part in an evaluation report. I.e., the aggregated ratings are divided by a factor of nine.

8.	The methodology clearly describes the level of stakeholder participation, data sources, and data collection and analysis methods.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
9.	The chosen methodology is adequately robust/appropriate for answering the key evaluation questions.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
10.	The methodology addresses methodological challenges and/or limitations.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Background			
11.	The report provides sufficient (but not too excessive) background information for understanding the context within which the subject of the evaluation operated.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Results overall:		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
12.	Results are easily identifiable (e.g., bold font, text boxes).	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
13.	Results clearly relate to the evaluation questions (in terms of report structure/substance).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
14.	Results are clearly formulated (they avoid ambiguities).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
15.	Results are supported by sufficient evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
16.	Results are objective. They are free from subjective judgements made by the evaluators.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
17.	Results uncover underlying causes for accomplishments/difficulties and opportunities to build on.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Conclusions overall:		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
18.	Conclusions are arrived at in separate chapter(s)/section(s) (they are not convoluted with results).	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	
19.	Conclusions build on the results (logical link).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
20.	Conclusions reflect the evaluators' professional opinion (they are not a summary of results).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
21.	Conclusions add value to the results (they are forward-looking).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
22.	Conclusions answer the big questions of the evaluation and focus on significant issues.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
Recommendations overall:		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

23.	Recommendations clearly and directly relate to the results and conclusions.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
24.	Recommendations are limited to a manageable number of key ones (avoid “laundry lists” of too prescriptive recommendations).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
25.	Recommendations are realistic (actionable).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
26.	The report specifies who should implement the recommendations.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Format overall:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
27.	The report is easy to read and understand (to the point; avoids complex language and unexplained acronyms).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
28.	The overall flow (structure) of the report is cohesive and logical.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
29.	The report uses relevant tables, charts and pictures to illustrate important points and information.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
30.	The annex contains information on methodology, including the evaluation ToR, the evaluation matrix, a bibliography and a list of people consulted.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	Overall rating of report	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

2. Overall focus of evaluation report

<p>1. Overall scope of evaluation: <i>Select only <u>one</u></i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Thematic: cutting across more than one sub-programme or programme</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Country-level</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Programme-level (i.e., entity-level)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sub-programme-level</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project-level</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p>	<p>2. Overall focus of evaluation report: <i>Select <u>all that apply</u></i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Policy directives</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project/programme design</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project/programme delivery/implementation (activities)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project/programme outcome or impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project/programme outputs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p>
---	---

3. Does the evaluation consider human rights (explicitly) in (<u>not</u> including gender equality/women’s rights):	
a. Evaluation scope and indicators	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence
b. Evaluation criteria and questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence
c. Evaluation methodology	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence
d. Evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence

4. Are Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) considerations included in:	
a. Evaluation scope and indicators	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence
b. Evaluation criteria and questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence
c. Evaluation methodology	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence
d. Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence

Continue here if above overall rating of the quality of report (results section) is “good” or “excellent”:

3. Content analysis (of programmes and projects)

Overall assessment made in the evaluation report of programme/project in terms of attaining results (all results levels)	<input type="checkbox"/> Largely positive results <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed results <input type="checkbox"/> Largely negative results
Key positive results	
Key negative results (results not achieved)	

Revised: July 2016.

Annex V. Comments from Secretariat Entities

Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support

1. DPKO and DFS are concerned that the criteria OIOS uses for requesting documents for the purpose of this report is too wide. When additional guidance was sought, OIOS encouraged more documents than less should be submitted. However, this was clearly unnecessary as over 40 documents were submitted by DPKO and DFS which met the OIOS criteria but subsequently OIOS only accepted three of the reports, and of those three, two were actually sampled for quality assessment. Greater clarity in the document request phase is required. OIOS' practice of encouraging as many documents as possible to be sent should be replaced by clearer guidance on the documents required. The ultimate use of only two documents shows that every office in DPKO and DFS invested unnecessary resources identifying documents. In addition, more robust guidelines on relevant documents would also minimise the unnecessary sharing of classified documents.
2. Whilst it is appreciated that OIOS is trying to simplify the presentation of the information by preparing the dashboards, as acknowledged by OIOS itself, the dashboards are not a mandated activity by the General Assembly (as opposed to the report itself), and the unnecessary rigidity of the dashboards and the assessment system they use, results in misleading information which does a disservice to OIOS efforts as well as entities such as DPKO and DFS, by failing to fully reflect the different structures, funding arrangements, roles and activities of the departments and offices. Each dashboard should clearly state specific funding arrangements, mandates, and any other factors that render these departments activities difficult to capture in the dashboards. As it currently stands, the dashboards do not reflect these differences and consequently distort some of the dashboard results.
3. On the DPKO and DFS resources and expenditure, as the DPKO and DFS Evaluation Team has repeatedly conveyed to OIOS, these two departments are primarily funded by the Support Account and NOT the Regular Budget. As the resources section of the dashboard only relates to Form 12 of the Regular Budget, the dashboard does not provide an accurate assessment of evaluation resource allocation in a peacekeeping context. The DPKO and DFS dashboard is extremely misleading in this regard. It is noted that OIOS has now agreed to insert a footnote clarifying the information, however in future the information should be more clearly displayed on the dashboard.
4. The Quality of Reports section of the dashboards highlights an unnecessarily technical and rigid approach. For example, finding that the report quality is zero percent but the recommendations from the very same reports are of 100 percent quality reflects that a checklist is being used to assess documents rather than a global and comprehensive reading of the reports. Recommendations are not made in isolation from reports - they come from the reports they are contained in and represent the culmination of the findings of the report. 100 percent for recommendations but zero percent for the report itself highlights the technical artificiality of the dashboards and does not fairly reflect the work of DPKO and DFS.
5. DPKO and DFS disagree with the rating of zero percent for human rights, rather the rating should be listed as "N/A" with a footnote explaining the difference. DPKO and DFS are primarily field operations driven. Hence the DPKO and DFS evaluations are focused on operational issues relevant to peacekeeping and do not generally look at human rights issues unless specifically required to do.

OIOS response to DPKO comments

1. It is regrettable that the guidance provided in the data request was not sufficient for the determination of which reports to submit for screening as evaluation reports. These same criteria were shared with other Departments without problem, and there was agreement between DPKO/DFS and OIOS on the strategy to submit a broader range of reports for OIOS review so as to be comprehensive. OIOS will continue to refine the guidance provided to entities when requesting evaluation reports for such assessment in future.
2. Although not specifically mandated by the General Assembly, OIOS has the authority, as per A/RES/48/218 B, “to initiate, carry out and report on any action which it considers necessary to fulfil its responsibilities with regard to monitoring, internal audit, inspection and evaluation and investigations.” In this regard, the issuance of the Dashboard is deemed to be a necessary and important complement to the aggregated information provided in the Biennial report on Strengthening Evaluation. The description of the limitations in paragraph 7 has been extended to note that the data source does not reflect actual resources spent on evaluation for DPKO-DFS and other entities which are largely funded by non-regular budget sources.
3. All concerns regarding the quality assessment have been recorded and OIOS will continue to work to improve the assessment in the future.
4. The comment regarding the nature of DPKO/DFS reports and their lack of amenability to the quality assessment is noted. This is reflective of the variation across the Secretariat in the nature of evaluation reports produced, and the challenge in assessing all of them using a uniform lens for purpose of the Biennial Report and Dashboard exercise. This will be kept in consideration for revising the quality assessment in the future.

Department of Economic and Social Affairs

1. It should be noted that there is a discrepancy in the score assessment given for DESA for the inputs and activities/outputs indicators. All the evaluation reports submitted by DESA that made it through to the final assessment phase of OIOS’ strata are project-related. These evaluation reports/activities were not covered by Regular Budget (Section 9), but rather by the Development Account (Section 35) or the Regular Programme of Technical Cooperation (RPTC) (Section 23). The two latter funds are overseen by the Capacity Development Office/ DESA. OIOS’ assessment did not include any of the Department’s evaluation reports and evaluation activities as indicated in the Forms 12 for the respective sub-programmes (9), required under Regular Budget (Section 9) and to which OIOS’ indicators relate. All these Forms 12 were submitted to OIOS for this assessment exercise.

The results reflected in the DESA evaluation scorecard stem exclusively from the evaluation reports of projects funded under the Development Account (Section 35) and the Regular Programme of Technical Cooperation (Section 23) and no reports from the normative and analytical work of the Department programmed under Section 9 of the Secretariat’s programme budget. Furthermore, the resources identified in the Forms 12 used in the preparation of the biennial programme budget relate to the Department’s normative and analytical work that is programmed under Section 9 of the Secretariat’s budget. This critical distinction is not highlighted in the DESA evaluation scorecard. Therefore, as presented, the scorecard reports that none of the assessed evaluation reports prepared by DESA, using resources identified by its Forms 12, i.e. under Section 9 of the regular budget, were of any meaningful quality.

This methodology cannot be used as a basis to assess the Department's performance. If this methodology is to be used, then it should be limited to an assessment of DESA projects carried out under the Development Account (Section 35) and the Regular Programme of Technical Cooperation (Section 23). A corresponding notation should be made that no assessments were made of the evaluation reports prepared under Section 9 of the Department's programme of work

2. An alternative methodology on the selection and screening of evaluation reports submitted by Programmes could be considered. The Department submitted 28 evaluation reports and only seven were screened. Out of the seven reports that were screened, only four made it through to the final assessment. Thus, the assessment gives an unrepresentative sample as it reflects only a few selected reports, disregarding all the other reports and the resources/staff time involved in producing those reports. Moreover, the Department submitted for this exercise evaluation reports from all its nine sub-programmes. Unfortunately, given OIOS' selection and assessment strata, only six sub-programmes had their evaluation reports screened. The methodology used therefore gives an unrepresentative sample as it does not ensure fair coverage/representation of all the nine sub-programmes of the Department. OIOS' assessment more or less reflects that only six sub-programmes submitted evaluation reports.

3. Assessment/indicator on report quality: The score assessment (0%) given for DESA on the quality of reports does not do justice to the efforts of the Department with regard to its evaluation work for the 2014-2015 biennium. The rating indicates that all the evaluation reports were equally bad on all criteria assessed, even though the reports reflected areas where quality met OIOS criteria. The strata methodology used by OIOS had limited the assessment to only a certain number of evaluation reports produced by the Department.

4. Although the quality assessments by OIOS are useful for the Department to consider its future work and for further improvements, the assessment should have taken into account whether there were any guidelines issued to assist programmes with their evaluation reports. It should be noted that out of the four DESA evaluation reports that OIOS thoroughly assessed and rated, three evaluation reports were produced and issued before the Department issued its project evaluation guidelines and DESA evaluation guidelines respectively. Moreover, the Department made adjustments to improve its evaluation work, including activities/outputs and outcomes as a result of OIOS' assessment and scorecards for previous biennia. Thus, the modifications to the indicators for 2014-2015 should have been proposed and made known by OIOS to the Programmes in advance.

OIOS response to DESA comments

1. The discrepancy between the sampled reports and evaluation resources has been noted in a footnote to the entity Dashboard, as discussed with DESA colleagues.
2. Reports were screened for specific criteria as noted in annex II of this report (see indicator 9). Reports which did not meet those criteria could not be included in the universe for the Biennial or Dashboard.

Economic Commission for Africa

In reference to the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) interoffice memorandum (IED-17-00050) dated 09 May 2017 on the subject. We fully appreciate the value and usefulness of the report in strengthening evaluation culture across the Secretariat in general and in ECA in particular.

We have reviewed the report and concur with most of the results. However, as already communicated to your office on a number of occasions, our concern is related to ECA's score on the quality of its evaluation report.

We reiterate our view that the low score assigned to ECA under "quality of report" is based on an assessment of an external evaluation conducted by a donor, which is precisely a **criterion for exclusion** as stated on page 77 of OIOS Scorecard report, under "Description of indicators and data sources – Evaluation report – ii. *“Was the report authored by OIOS, JIU, BoA or a donor (criterion for exclusion)”*".

We take note that the quality assessment was done on the basis of a randomly selected stratified sample of 100 evaluation reports from 21 entities, but the "ECA evaluation report" which was selected to be included in the sample was not undertaken or owned by ECA but rather conducted by the European Union. During the planning and implementation of the evaluation, ECA was not in a position to substantively influence the quality of the final product. The report was shared to showcase that ECA's Evaluation Section is involved in coordination activities that require time and human resources. It should not be considered as ECA's output.

In light of the above, we suggest that another colour code or a "not applicable" statement be introduced for this particular case. We believe that a small footnote will not be sufficient and may lead to misinterpretation of results and an inaccurate reading of ECA's performance despite tremendous efforts made to strengthen its evaluation function since 2013.

I thank you in advance for your understanding. Should you have any queries please contact my colleague Mrs. Eskedar Nega, Chief Evaluation Section who can be reached at enega@uneca.org

OIOS response to ECA comments

These comments have been incorporated into the Dashboard report.

Economic Commission for Europe

I refer to your member of 9 May 2017 transmitting the OIOS on United Nations Evaluation Dashboard 2014-15.

UNECE appreciates the ongoing efforts of OIOS to highlight the importance of evaluation in the UN Secretariat. Notably, the Evaluation Dashboard for 2012-13 contributed directly to the strengthening of the UNECE evaluation function, which is now delivering tangible improvements in accountability and quality of evaluations conducted in UNECE.

With respect to the UNECE Dashboard 2014-15, we acknowledge that this biennium was unusual for UNECE, with preparation of a fewer number of evaluation reports due to a focus on enhancing evaluation architecture most notably the approval of the UNECE Evaluation Policy in October 2014.

In this regard, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight other evaluation activities undertaken during 2014-15, namely:

- Approval by the UNECE Executive Committee (EXCOM) of the UNECE Evaluation Policy in October 2014;
- Approval by the EXCOM of the first Biennial Evaluation Workplan 2016-17, in October 2014;
- Development of the UNECE Evaluation Guide, which supports staff responsible for managing evaluations and includes guidance on integrating gender and human rights in evaluation design;

- Launch of the OpenUNECE website, where all evaluation reports published since October 2014, including management responses and progress reports are made publicly available.

In addition, key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-15 biennium include:

- Biennial Evaluation Workplans are regularly submitted to the UNECE Executive Committee (EXCOM) for approval;
- Reports of programme-wide evaluations conducted in UNECE are submitted for EXCOM approval; and
- The UNECE EXCOM have continuously called for the strengthening of evaluation, as recently as March 2017 requesting the Secretariat to produce an Annual Report on evaluation, which is presently under development.

We do appreciate the improved assessment of our efforts in the planning and oversight of the evaluation function and our evaluation budget which reflect efforts taken in this regard.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Report OIOS on the United Nations Evaluation Dashboard 2014-15, and the ongoing constructive engagement between our respective offices.

Office of Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

1. Thank you for your memo of 9 May 2017, transmitting the draft report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the United Nations Evaluation Dashboard 2014-2015.
2. OCHA would like to provide the following formal comments to the report:
 - Thank you for the assessment provided in this report, which will help OCHA to continue strengthening its evaluation function.
 - OCHA is pleased to note that the organization's scoring has improved from the 2014-2015 reporting on six indicators. OCHA also welcomes that Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation of the Response to the Crisis in South Sudan" has been one of the only six evaluation reports in the UN Secretariat to receive a rating of "excellent."
 - The report gives an overall score of 1/6 on the indicator on "procedures in use." However, it should be noted that OCHA procedures included in the assessment (evaluation workplan, action plans for implementing recommendations, monitoring the implementation of recommendations, disseminating evaluation reports and lessons learned) and aims to have implemented all six procedures by the end of the current year.
 - OCHA did not provide information on sub-programmes referenced by evaluation reports because, given the centrality of humanitarian response to OCHA's work, as well as OCHA's mandate to coordinate system-wide humanitarian evaluations, the selection of topics for OCHA evaluations is not directly based on its sub-programmes. For example, for system-wide humanitarian evaluations, Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) organizations play an important role in deciding the evaluation focus. These go beyond the scope of work of OCHA's sub-programmes. Therefore this indicator is in our view, not applicable for the assessment of OCHA's evaluation function.
 - It should be noted that OCHA issued eight evaluation reports during the biennium, which is a substantial number, given the size and resources of its evaluation unit.

- The Organization is currently undergoing a change management process, which, among other things, is expected to revise the reporting lines in the organization.
- OCHA aims to achieve consistently good or excellent quality across our evaluation reports, ensuring that human rights are considered in evaluations.

3. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and your staff for their excellent collaboration throughout this process.

Department of Public Information

As mentioned in the introductory text, DPI's evaluation policy came into force in January 2016 and provides a formal framework for the Department's ongoing evaluation work.

Please note, the information on the monitoring and evaluation budget contains erroneous information. The total amount for 2014-15, as indicated in DPI's proposed budget fascicle (A/68/6 Sect. 28, para. 28.14), was \$1.14 million, not \$4.5 million. Correspondingly, the monitoring and evaluation budget as a percentage of the total programme budget was 0.61%.

The review of DPI's evaluation report noted the absence of a section on "conclusions" and that the recommendations were not integrated into the body of the report. DPI notes that its report included conclusions (titled as "key finding") with clear linkages between results, conclusions and recommendations, and should have been scored accordingly. DPI takes note, however, of the OIOS finding with regard to the format of the evaluation report.

OIOS response to DPI comments

The footnote to the DPI Dashboard reflects the clarification that data on monitoring and evaluation in DPI's proposed budget fascicle (A/68/6 Sect. 28, para. 28.14) is more accurate than what was submitted by DPI to OPPBA through Form 12.

International Trade Centre

1. Thank you for your memorandum dated 9 May 2017 transmitting the draft report of the Office of the Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the United Nations Evaluation Dashboard 2014-2015 for our review and comments. We recognize that the comments from our focal points have been incorporated into the draft, and we thank you for taking the effort to correctly reflect the total programme budget by using the Board of Auditors Report (A/71/5 (Vol. HI)).

2. We also appreciate the extended opportunity to comment on the final draft of the full report. In this regard, we kindly request that the following two bullet points be added to section 'IV Key enhancements made since the end of the 2014-2015 biennium' on page 44 of the document:

- The independence of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit was strengthened. In the new JTC organization chart, October 2016, an explicit reporting line from the Unit directly to the Office of the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director was introduced. The independence was further emphasized with the change of the Unit name to Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). (For your reference, please see attached the new ITC organization chart.)

- Increased, comprehensive monitoring of evaluation-related activities conducted by outside agencies such as the JIU, OIOS and funders, has enabled ITC to identify repeated topics of review, and to sharpen its focus on areas that warrant attention.

3. I express my appreciation for the work of OIOS and look forward to our future productive collaboration.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

1. ECLAC welcomes this comprehensive report, which provides a comprehensive overview of the evaluation capacity of the entities of the Secretariat. We are pleased to inform that ECLAC has no additional comments on the report.

2. ECLAC would like to take this opportunity to thank OIOS for the collaborative and participative approach throughout the elaboration of this report.