


Independent system- wide evaluation mechanism:

**Comprehensive review of
existing institutional
framework for system-
wide evaluation of
operational activities for
development of the United
Nations System mandated
in GA resolution 64/289**

Final Work Plan

By
Angela Bester
Charles Lusthaus



July 2011

Acronyms

CEB	Chief Executives Board
CPC	Committee for Programmes and Coordination
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
GA	General Assembly
IASC	Inter-Agency Steering Committee?
ILO	International Labour Organization
ISWE	Independent System-Wide Evaluation
JIU	Joint Inspection Unit
OCHA	Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODSG	Office of the Deputy Secretary-General
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDESA	UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

Contents

1. Introduction	5
1.1 Assessment, Scope and Objectives	5
1.2 Objectives of this Work Plan	5
2. Developing this Work plan	6
3. Methodology for the Evaluation	6
3.1 Introduction	6
3.2 Major Questions	6
3.3 Data Sources and data collection instruments	7
3.4 Data Collection Tools	8
3.5 Data Analysis	8
3.6 Evaluation Matrix	8
4. Key Deliverables and Timelines	10
4.1 Milestones	10
5. Suggested Draft Outline of Final Report	11
6. Resources	11
7. Evaluation Management	11
7.1 Evaluation Team Members	11
7.2 Roles and Responsibilities	11
8. Study Limitations	12

Exhibits

Exhibit 3.1 Summary of our methodology	9
Exhibit 4.1 Deliverables and Timelines – Work plan	10

Appendices

Appendix I Bibliography	13
Appendix II List of Stakeholders Consulted During Work Plan Phase	21
Appendix III : Suggested list of additional interviewees	25
Appendix IV Definitions of key terms	27
Appendix V Self Assessment Questionnaire	29
Appendix VI Interview Guide	33
Appendix VII Institutional Evaluation Respondents	35

“The true measure of the success for the United Nations is not how much we promise, but how much we deliver for those who need us most”.

United Nations Secretary-General-elect, Ban Ki-moon Acceptance Speech to the General Assembly upon election 2006

1. Introduction

In June 2011, the Office of the Deputy Secretary-General contracted Ms. Angela Bester and Dr. Charles Lusthaus to conduct a comprehensive review of the existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation at the United Nations. This document outlines the consulting team’s proposed approach for the comprehensive review of the existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation of operational activities for development of the United Nations (UN) System.¹

1.1 Assessment, Scope and Objectives

The comprehensive review of the existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation of operational activities for development, mandated in GA resolution 64/289, is expected to provide recommendations to Member States on how to further strengthen this important function in the work of the UN system. The establishment of an independent system-wide evaluation mechanism within the UN system should also be aimed at fully utilizing and strengthening the existing institutional framework and capacities.

The review will be carried out as a two-step process, consisting of a **Work Plan Phase** and a **Delivery Phase**. This work plan was developed following a trip to New York where the consultants interviewed 27 people (see Appendix II), had a group meeting with the Reference group and had a chance to collect important documents as represented in our preliminary bibliography (see Appendix I).

1.2 Objectives of this Work Plan

The objectives of the work plan are:

- 1) To clarify the proposed set of questions outlined in the Terms of Reference and suggest a methodology for answering the questions that will provide a thorough review of the existing mechanisms for system-wide evaluation as well as the capacity of individual evaluation entities to contribute to such undertakings.
- 2) To formulate an approach for developing the parameters that will be used to suggest design options to further strengthen system-wide evaluation of operational activities for development at the UN.

This work plan will suggest a process for meeting the objectives within the financial resources allocated for this task. The link between the proposed approach and the resources assigned sets up some limitations that are outlined in this work plan. The work plan proposes a methodology, reviews accountabilities and responsibilities, provides a work-schedule and milestones, and allocates resources in a budget. An outline for the final report is suggested as well.

¹ The review will include in part the humanitarian work of the UN.

2. Developing this Work plan

The assessment will follow the appropriate principles, standards, and practices set out in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards for Evaluation² in the UN System 2005. Stakeholder participation will be an integral component of assessment design and planning, information collection, the review of findings, assessment reporting, and results dissemination.

Comprehensive review of existing mechanisms for system-wide evaluation and of individual evaluation entities can be complex. This objective, reviewing the past practices and creating options for the future in a highly complex organisation, like the UN, requires an acceptable level of existing data, cooperation on the part of stakeholders to help fill in information gaps, and a lot of good will. To help develop this work plan, it was agreed with Reference Group that the evaluators do the following:

- 1) Do a preliminary review of material that exists in New-York in order to ascertain the quantity and quality of the existing data.
- 2) Do preliminary interviews in New-York with relevant past and present staff in order to obtain other relevant materials for the assignment, their perspective on both the review process and the forward looking report as well as identify future interviewees.
- 3) Synthesize the preliminary data into a work plan that can deliver on the objectives and questions posed by the study. The work plan should further clarify expectations.

Section 3 of this report outlines the approach and methodology of the evaluation. Section 4 suggests a timeline and key deliverables. Section 5 of the work plan provides a task analysis.

3. Methodology for the Evaluation

3.1 Introduction

The methodology for this review is designed to meet the requirements and budget set out in the TOR. This section clarifies the major questions, suggests the data sources and sampling strategies that will be used to answer these questions and the analytical tools that will be used to analyze the data. The definition of terms plays an important role in this review. The TORs identify four terms, namely, *system-wide*; *independence*; *evaluation*; and operational Activity for development. These and other terms such as, institutional framework, capacity, governance and so forth will be explored with interviewees as part of the review. Appendix IV provides the initial terms and definitions:

3.2 Major Questions

The study will seek to answer the following overarching evaluation questions as presented in the TORs:

- 1) What is the demand for independent system-wide evaluation, and how would it be used?
- 2) What constitutes a good independent system-wide evaluation and what kind of mandates and capacities would be required to do one?
- 3) What capacity exists to manage, conduct and contribute to an independent system-wide evaluation (based on past experiences [validation through review and interview])?
- 4) How could the UN system address capacity gaps in independent system-wide evaluation in the future building on existing mechanisms?

² This study is a prospective review of the ISWE in the UN. As such while it will follow many of the standards related to protocols and evidence to answer the questions posed, it will not include the typical evaluation issues of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, value for money, impact sustainability and so forth.

A fifth question was added during our inception mission in New York. During our mission, it became apparent that the UN resolution suggested that report contain a review of the existing institutional framework for system wide evaluation. We framed the question as:

- 5) What is the present institutional framework for system wide evaluation of operational activities for development?

These questions will be addressed in our final report³.

3.3 Data Sources and data collection instruments

The review team will collect data from the following sources:

1) Desk review and documented material

The team will review relevant documentation suggested by the reference group, other informants and those documents available on the UN web sites. In addition, the review team will seek out other documentation through literature searches in both the academic and grey literature. As previously noted a list of the documents is found in Appendix I.

2) Case studies

The team will review system-wide evaluations undertaken in the past 5 years to identify lessons on the process of conducting, managing or supporting system-wide evaluation activities. The Reference group suggested that the review team include the following case studies: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, Delivering-as-One, South Africa, South-South and Triangular Cooperation, and Real Time Evaluations for Pakistan and Haiti. No meta assessment will be made of the cases. However, lessons from these experiences will be sought.

3) Institutional descriptions

A questionnaire (Appendix IV) was sent to the UN system evaluation offices, by the Office of the Deputy Secretary-General to provide a preliminary map and identify existing capacity and practice with specific focus on their ability to engage in system-wide evaluation activities. In addition UNEG agreed to update their “fact sheets” on the evaluation departments and units in the UN. These documents will be analyzed by the review team. Particular focus will be placed on five entities in the system: Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and UNEG. In all 23 questionnaires were returned for analysis. The list of those returning questionnaires is found in Appendix V. The Self Assessment Questionnaire is found in Appendix VII.

4) Interviews

The team will interview relevant member state representatives, members of the UN evaluation community (UNEG, secretariat and agency evaluation offices, JIU) as well as internal and external potential recipients and users of system-wide evaluations (e.g. Member States, Committee on Programmes and Coordination, Chief Executives Board, UN Development Group), . In addition, outside experts opinions will be sought. In addition to the 27 interviewees already queried, a list of suggested interviewees can be found in Appendix III. The interview protocol used as a basis for the interviews is found in Appendix VI.

³ It is important to note that the TORs suggest that the consultants make recommendations regarding ISWE. However, some of the interviewees in New York, contended that the resolution only requested a descriptive study, not one with recommendations.

5) *Stakeholder workshops*

The review team will conduct two sessions in New York to be attended by members of the Reference Group, members of the individual evaluation offices of the UN organizations, CEB, UNDG, JIU and IASC. The sessions will be both feedback sessions to the evaluators as well as data collection sessions. The first workshop will be to provide stakeholders with our preliminary impressions and findings with respect to the questions presented to the evaluators. The evaluators will identify data gaps and present and validate preliminary findings of the review. The workshop will also foreshadow for the UN evaluation community the gaps in mandates and capacities that the evaluators are identifying with respect to developing a, high quality independent UN system-wide evaluations. Member States representatives will be invited to join the second half of the meeting so as to build confidence in the findings and recommendations emerging from this review.

The second workshop will be on the consultants draft report. In this workshop the consultants will be requesting corrections regarding factual errors as well as providing commentary related to their conclusions and recommendations. The stakeholders will be invited to provide verbal and written comments to the team. The review team will be responsible for consolidating and considering these comments on their merit in finalizing the report.

Both workshops will be facilitated by the review team. The review team leader will work with the Reference Group in organizing the workshop, including drafting the agenda, drawing up the methodology and identifying participants.

3.4 Data Collection Tools

Two data collection tools will be used for the study. The first is the institutional self- assessment questionnaire sent out by the Office of the Deputy Secretary-General to identify experience and capacity of the system. The second is the interview guide used for interviews. Both are found in the Appendix. Other frameworks and tools will be developed as required.

3.5 Data Analysis

There will be both quantitative and qualitative data used to answer the questions posed in the assessment framework. Most quantitative data will be analyzed through various types of descriptive analysis. Content analysis will be used to review qualitative data. Content analysis identifies themes which emerge from written data. These themes are then analyzed in order to answer the main questions of the study. Findings in the study will triangulate data for improving their reliability. When feasible and available, the study will make judgments through pre-established criteria or through generally accepted norms.

3.6 Evaluation Matrix

Exhibit 3.1 provides a summary table of our methodology. It is a table which links the study questions to the sources, data collection tools, and analysis.

Exhibit 3.1 Summary of our methodology

Issue	Data collection and sources	Sample	Procedure for analysis	Comments
Demand and use of ISWE	Semi-structured interviews with producers and (potential) users of evaluations in the UN System. Quantitative data presented by producers of evaluations in the UN System	Selected representatives from Member States (Programme countries and donor countries) UN Secretariat (DESA, OCHA, OIOS); UN Programmes and Funds JIU; UNEG; UNDG; CEB.	Content analysis of interview data	Ensure that regional representation of Member States in sample.
Present institutional framework for ISWE in UN	Data from self-assessment questionnaires completed by JIU; DESA; OCHA; OIOS; UNEG UNEG Fact Sheets on evaluation departments and units in UN Annual and ad hoc reports of UN institutions with evaluation mandate Semi-structured interviews with producers of evaluations in the UN System	JIU; DESA; OCHA; OIOS; UNEG to be the focus Other UN institutions: ILO, UNAIDS, UNCTAD, OHCHR, UNHCR, WHO	Mapping responses against pre-determined institutional framework criteria	Needs adequate representation of evaluation units.
Present capacity for ISWE in UN	Data from self-assessment questionnaires completed by JIU; DESA; OCHA; OIOS; UNEG UNEG Fact Sheets on evaluation departments and units in UN Data from interviews	JIU; DESA; OCHA; OIOS; UNEG to be focus Other UN institutions: ILO, UNAIDS, UNCTAD, OHCHR, UNHCR, WHO	Mapping responses from self-assessment. Descriptive analysis of quantitative data. Content analysis for qualitative data.	Self-assessment questionnaire is in Appendix VII
Institutional framework for good ISWE	Data gathered through stakeholder workshop Data gathered through semi-structured interviews with selected external institutions	Selected representatives from Member States (Programme countries and donor countries) UN Secretariat (DESA, OCHA, OIOS); UN Programmes and Funds JIU; UNEG; UNDG; CEB.	Descriptive analysis of responses from respondents.	Ensure that regional representation of Member States in sample.

Issue	Data collection and sources	Sample	Procedure for analysis	Comments
Potential ways to address capacity gaps	Data gathered through stakeholder workshop Data gathered through semi-structured interviews with selected users and producers of evaluations.	Selected representatives from Member States (Programme countries and donor countries) UN Secretariat (DESA, OCHA, OIOS); UN Programmes and Funds JIU; UNEG; UNDG; CEB.	Themes will be analyzed from the data.	Ensure that regional representation of Member States in sample. Emphasis will be on practical, implementable proposals.

4. Key Deliverables and Timelines

4.1 Milestones

Exhibit 4.1 lists the work plan deliverables, and outlines envisaged timelines for this phase of the assessment.

Exhibit 4.1 Deliverables and Timelines – Work plan

Completion date	Task(s)	Responsibility
11 March 2011	Finalize TOR	ODSG
30 March 2011	Circulate self assessment tool to relevant UN evaluation entities	ODSG
30 March 2011	Finalize selection of two consultants	ODSG
15 June 2011	Return self-assessment questionnaire	Respective entities
15 June 2011	Start documentation review, interviews, analysis of self assessments etc.	Review team
18-22 July 2011	Geneva data collection	Review team
15 August 2011	Review Team Member returns to NY for data gathering.	Depends on budget
1 July. – 30 September 2011	Conduct interviews and undertake analysis; interviews; documentation review; drafting of report	Review team
End of September 2011	Convene 1-day stakeholder consultation to discuss findings and preliminary thoughts about recommendations.	Review team with support from ODSG
End of October 2011	Presents Draft report including findings and recommendation for discussion and feedback.-	Review team with support from ODSG
15 November 2011	Draft report sent to “Expert Readers”	ODSG
2 December 2011	Finalize report and send for official editing and circulation to Member States	ODSG

5. Suggested Draft Outline of Final Report

The text box provides a preliminary outline of the final report.

Draft Outline of Final Report

1. Introduction
2. Methodology
3. Independent System Wide Evaluation Context in the UN
4. Rationale, relevance and demand for ISWE
5. Capacity to deliver on demand
6. Existing ISWE Gaps
7. Characteristics of a good ISWE Mechanism(s)-
8. Recommendations
9. Concluding comments
10. Appendix

6. Resources

The budget is being managed by the Office of the Deputy Secretary-General.

7. Evaluation Management

7.1 Evaluation Team Members

The Assessment Team consists of:

- Charles Lusthaus, Senior Consultant Universal Management Group
- Angela Bester, Senior Consultant
- Research Assistance- if funds available

7.2 Roles and Responsibilities

Office of the Deputy Secretary-General (ODSG)

The Office of the Deputy Secretary-General (ODSG) will oversee the management of the review process within the UN system:

- To facilitate data gathering activities in NY and Geneva;
- To provide, if required introductions to specialized agencies;
- To support for 1-day stakeholder consultation to validate accuracy of preliminary findings of self-assessments and documentation review;
- To support for 1-day stakeholder consultation to discuss draft report on findings & recommendations of review team;
- To send Draft report to “Expert Readers”; and

- To finalize report and send for official editing and circulation to Member States.

The Reference Group

A Reference Group, composed of experts from JIU, OIOS, UNEG, DESA, and Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance (OCHA), will be established:

- To advise the ODSG;
- To facilitate effective engagement of UN evaluation entities in the review process; and
- To comment on the draft report as part of the quality assurance process.

UNEG will also keep its member organizations informed of progress in the review exercise.

External expert readers will be engaged to comment on the draft report of the review team prior to finalization

Review team members (Charles Lusthaus, Angela Bester)

The review team will:

- Jointly review and validate the findings of the self assessments undertaken by evaluation entities;
- Review documentation from earlier system-wide evaluation efforts as well as other material mentioned here above;
- Interview staff of UN evaluation entities as well as Member States;
- Design and help organize two stakeholder workshops (as a background document for the first stakeholder workshop, the review team will produce an inception report with adequate details about the proposed approach to the exercise);
- Conduct an independent assessment of the existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation of UN operational activities for development; and
- And prepare a report to serve as the basis for intergovernmental deliberations as mandated in Assembly resolution 64/289.

8. Study Limitations

To date a few limitations have occurred that could affect the quality of the study. The review team will do everything possible to mitigate the effects of these concerns.

- The difficulty obtaining funding for the study delayed the start and put data collection approximately two months behind schedule.
- Confusion related to the process of conducting the institutional survey has caused some agencies to indicate some hesitancy in their filling out the questionnaire.
- No research support for doing data analysis.
- Limited number of JIU inspectors available during mission to Geneva. The review team had an opportunity to have a group interview with three inspectors.
- It is unclear to the reviewers who will be tasked with the implementation of the recommendations of the study; thus, utilisation of this work could be at risk.

Appendix I Bibliography

References

- Abraszewski, A., Hennes, R., Martohadinegoro et al. (1993). *Accountability and Oversight in the United Nations Secretariat*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/Rep/93/5).
- African Development Bank Group. (2007). *Independent Evaluation Policy and Functional Responsibilities of the Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV)*. Operations Evaluation Department: African Development Bank Group.
- Ahlenius, I. (2010). *End of Assignment Report*. Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Oversight Services: United Nations.
- Asian Development Bank. (2003). *Enhancing the Independence and Effectiveness of the Operations Evaluation Department*. Asian Development Bank. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.adb.org/documents/policies/enhancing-oed.pdf>.
- Asian Development Bank. (2008). *Review of the Independence and Effectiveness of the Operations Evaluation Department*. Asian Development Bank.
- Balogun, P. (2007). *Meta-Analysis of Country-Level Evaluations – Background Analysis for the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System, Version 3*.
- Bana e Costa, C., and Beinart, E. (2005). *Model-structuring in Public Decision-aiding*. Department of Operational Research: London School of Economics. Working Paper LSEOR 05.79.
- Beck, T. (2009). *Joint Humanitarian Impact Evaluation: Options Paper*. Commissioned by the Evaluation and Studies Section: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.
- Bond. (n.d.). *Submission to the Independent Commission for Ad Impact (ICAI) 3 Year Workplan Consultation*. London: Bond.
- Centeno, R., Hermoso R., Billhardt, H. et al. (n.d.). *Towards a Conceptual Framework*
- Chief Executives Board Secretariat. (2010). *Consideration for the Establishment of an Independent System-wide Evaluation Mechanism*. Retrieved 11 July 2011 from <http://www.un.org/ga/president/64/issues/swc40510.pdf>
- Chulkov, N. (2011). *Review of the Medical Service in the United Nations System*. United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (JIU/REP/2011/1).
- Cosgrave, J. (2007). *Synthesis Report: Expanded Summary – Joint Evaluation of the International Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*. London: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition.
- Department for International Development. (2003). *Promoting Institutional and Organisational Development*. London: Department for International Development.
- Department for International Development. (2009). *Independent Evaluation in DFID: Annual Report 2009*. Head of Evaluation: Department for International Development.
- Evaluation Cooperation Group. (n.d.). *Template for Assessing the Independence of Evaluation Organizations*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <https://wpqr1.adb.org/LotusQuickr/ecg/Main.nsf/9bd8546fb7a652c948257731002a062b/f93ea16b7e4e42bd48257731002a0668/?OpenDocument>.
- Fall, P. and Zahran, M. (2010). *United Nations Corporate Partnerships: The Role and Functioning of the Global Compact*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations.
- Garcia, O. A. (2011). *Challenges for conducting UNDAF Evaluations*. United Nations Evaluation Group Evaluation Practice Exchange: Session on the Harmonization of Evaluation in the UN System. Paris 21-22 March, 2011.
- Garriga, S., Balogun, P., Pham, T. et al. (2010). *Independent Review of the UNDP Evaluation Policy*. Evaluation Office: United Nations Development Programme.

- Girodo, M. (2007). *A Culture of Review of the Investigations Division of the OIOS*. Consultant's Report submitted to Inga-Britt Ahlenius – Under-Secretary-General of the Office of Internal Oversight Services.
- Glowka, L. (2003) *Law and Modern Biotechnology Selected Issues of Relevance to Food and Agriculture: FAO Oversight Mechanisms*. Retrieved 11 July from: <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/006/Y4839E/y4839e05.htm>
- González, A. (2003). *Evaluation of the United Nations Volunteers Programme*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/Rep/2003/7).
- Grünewald, F., Binder, A. and Georges, Y. (2010). *Inter-agency Real-time Evaluation in Haiti: 3 Months after the Earthquake – Final Report*. Berlin: Global Public Policy Institute/ Paris: Groupe u.r.d.
- Heider, C. (n.d.). *Conceptual Framework for Developing Evaluation Capacities, Building on Good Practices in Evaluation Capacity Development*. Retrieved 11 July 2011 from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLACREGTOPPOVANA/Resources/Paper_Caroline_Heider_Evaluation_Capacity_Development_Advance.pdf
- Hein, E.W. (2007). *Review of UN System-coherence and Coordination with Particular Focus on the Common Country Assessment (CCA), the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the Resident Coordinator System Background Study to the TCPR 2007*.
- Imas, L. (2010). *Competency Framework Development for IDEAS: Review of Existing Framework*.
- Imas, L. (2010). *The Movement for Global Competencies for Development Evaluators – A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Evaluation Society*, May 3, 2010 in Victoria B.C.
- Independent Oversight Mechanism Team, Coalition for The International Criminal Court. (2009). *Comments and Recommendations to the Eighth Session of the Assembly of States Parties 18 - 26 November 2009*, The Hague: The International Criminal Court.
- Inomata, T. (2008). *Management Review of Environmental Governance within the United Nations System*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/REP/2008/3).
- International Fund for Agricultural Development. (2011). *Action plan for strengthening the self-evaluation system*. (EC 2011/68/W.P.9).
- International Monetary Fund. (2011). *IMF Performance in the Run-up to the Financial and Economic Crisis: IMF Surveillance in 2004-07*. Independent Evaluation Office: International Monetary Fund.
- International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions. (2004). *Guidelines for Internal Control Standards for the Public Sector*. General Secretariat: International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions.
- Jones, H. and Mendizabal, E. (2010). *Strengthening Learning from Research and Evaluation: Going with the Grain – Final Report*. Research and Policy in Development: Overseas Development Institute.
- Kepplinger, G. L. (2009). *Inspectors General Independent Oversight of Financial Regulatory Agencies*. United States Government Accountability Office.
- Khadka, S. (2011). *Results Measurement Framework for 2010-2012*. International Fund for Agricultural Development.
- Kuyama, S. (2001). *Enhancing Governance Oversight Role: Structure, Working Methods and Practices on Handling Oversight Reports*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/Rep/2001/4).
- Larrabure, J. (2007). *Knowledge Management in the United Nations System*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/REP/2007/6).
- Lindores, D. (2007). *Funding for UN Technical Cooperation Activities*. UN Department of Economic & Social Affairs.
- Management Consulting Courses. (n.d.). *Course 035 Organisational Culture*. Retrieved on 11 July 2011 from: <http://managementconsultingcourses.com/Lesson35OrganisationalCulture.pdf>
- Münch, W. (1995). *The Role and Working Methods of a Comprehensive Oversight Institution in the United Nations Systems*. The Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

- Office of the Deputy Secretary-General. (2011). *Independent System-wide Evaluation Mechanism: Comprehensive Review of Existing Institutional Framework for System-wide evaluation of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System Mandated in GA Resolution 64/289*. United Nations.
- Organizational Mechanisms in Multiagent Systems*. Madrid: Centre for Intelligent Information Technologies (CETINIA), University Rey Juan Carlos.
- Ortiz, E. and Inomata, T. (2006). *Evaluation of Results-based Budgeting in Peacekeeping Operations*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/Rep/2006/1).
- Ortiz, E. and Larrabure, J. (2008). *Special Representatives of the Secretary General and Resident Coordinators: A Benchmarking Framework for Coherence within the United Nations System*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations.
- Ortiz, E., Gorita, I., Kuyama, S. et al. (2004). *Overview of the Series of Reports on Managing for Results in the United Nations System*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/REP/2004/5).
- Pajunen, K. (2008). *The Nature of Organizational Mechanisms*. Organization Studies, 29 (11). 1449-1468.
- Picciotto, R. (2008). *Evaluation Independence at DFID: An Independent Assessment prepared for IADCI*. Independent Advisory Committee for Development Impact: Department for International Development.
- Picciotto, R. (2011). *The Logic of Evaluation Professionalism*. London: Sage.
- Polastro, R., Nagrah, A., Steen, N. et al. (2011). *Intra-Agency Real-time Evaluation of the Humanitarian Response to Pakistan's 2010 Flood Crisis*. Madrid: DARA.
- Robert, P. and Engelhardt, A. (2009). *OCHA Meta-Evaluation: Final Report*. Jul 21, 2009. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from http://ochanet.unocha.org/p/Documents/OCHA_Meta-evaluation_Final_Report.pdf.
- Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon. *My priorities as Secretary-General, A Stronger United Nations for a Better World*. Retrieved on 11 July 2011 from: <http://www.un.org/sg/priority.shtml>.
- Siegfried, G., Bichsel, A., Sauvinet-Bedouin, R. et al. (2009). *Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations*. Berne: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.
- Sossin, L. (2004). *The Oversight of Executive Police Relations in Canada: the Constitution, the Courts, Administrative Processes and Democratic Governance*. (For the Ipperwash Inquiry). Retrieved 11 July from: http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries/ipperwash/policy_part/meetings/pdf/Sossin.pdf
- Steering Committee: International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers (n.d.). *Elements of a Governance and Oversight Mechanism for the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers: A Concept Paper*. Retrieved on 11 July 2011 from: http://www.icoc-ppsp.org/uploads/Draft_ICoC_Oversight_Concept_Paper.pdf
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. (2009). *Peer Review of the Evaluation Function of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations. (OIOS)*. Berne: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.
- The American Non-Governmental Organizations Coalition for the International Criminal Court. (2008). *Questions & Answers on an Independent Oversight Mechanism for the International Criminal Court*. Retrieved on 11 July 2011 from: <http://www.amicc.org/docs/OversightQA.pdf>.
- Theisohn, T. (2007). *How to Enhance the Effectiveness of the UN system in Supporting Capacity Development? Background study to the TCPR 2007*. (Final Report).
- UK Aid/ Department for International Development. (n.d.) Assessment Framework for Multilateral Aid Review Assessments.
- UN Global Compact. (2011). *UN Global Compact Rejects Joint Inspection Unit Report, Urges Corrections*. Retrieved 05 July from <http://www.unglobalcompact.org/news/109-03-24-2011>.
- United Nations . (2011). *Strengthening the UN webpage*. Retrieved 11 July 2011 from: <http://www.un.org/en/strengtheningtheun/results.shtml>

- United Nations Development Programme. (2007). *Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to South-South Cooperation*. Evaluation Office: United Nations Development Programme.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2011). *National Evaluation Capacities: Proceedings from the International Conference, 15-17 December 2009*. Evaluation Office: United Nations Development Programme.
- United Nations Evaluation Group (2010). *Evaluability Assessments of the Programme Country Pilots: Delivering as One - Synthesis Report*. United Nations Evaluation Group.
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2005). *Norms for the Evaluation in the UN System*. UN EG/FN/Norms(2005).
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2005). *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*. UNEG/FN/Standards. United Nations Evaluation Group
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2005). *United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation*. United Nations Evaluation Group: United Nations. (UNEG/REF(2007)2). Retrieved on 12 July 2011 from: www.oecd.org/dataoecd/59/11/34700165.ppt
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2007). *Establishing a UN-wide Evaluation System*. United Nations Evaluation Group.
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2007). *Evaluation in the UN System*. United Nations Evaluation Group. Retrieved on 06 July 2011 from http://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/WG-GOVandFiN/Evaluation_in_the_UN_system1.pdf.
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2007). *Oversight and Evaluation in the UN System*. United Nations Evaluation Group: United Nations. (UNEG/REF(2007)2).
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2007). *UNEG – Considerations in the Strengthening of UN-wide Evaluation*. High-Level Panel on Coherence Report Working Group: United Nations Evaluation Group.
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2009). *UNEG Principles of Working Together*. UNEG/FN/PWT(2009).
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2010). *Comments by UNEG Heads on the CEB paper “Modalities for the Establishment of an Independent System-wide Evaluation Mechanism”*. Evaluation Group: United Nations.
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2010). *Comments by UNEG on the CEB Draft Note “Proposal for the Establishment of an Independent System-wide Evaluation Mechanism*. United Nations Evaluation Group.
- United Nations Evaluation Group. (2010). *UNEG Secretariat Report on the Sixty Fourth Plenary on System-wide Coherence*. United Nations Evaluation Group.
- United Nations General Assembly. (2003). *Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the Preliminary Review of its Statute and Working Methods*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/58/343).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2003). *Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the Preliminary Review of its Statute and Working Methods - Addendum*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/58/343/Add.2).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2003). *Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the In-depth Review of its Statute and Working Methods - Addendum*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/58/343/Add.1).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2003). *Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the In-depth Review of its Statute and Working Methods - Addendum*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/58/343/Add.2).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2005). *Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly: 59/267. Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/RES/59/267).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2006). *Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit, Note by the Secretary-General*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/61/583).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2007). *Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/62/1).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2008). *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly: System-wide Coherence*. A/RES/62/277. United Nations General Assembly.

- United Nations General Assembly. (2008). *Review of results-based management at the United Nations Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/63/268).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2009). *Report of the Joint Inspection Unit for 2008 and Programme of Work for 2009*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/63/34).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2009). *Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/64/1).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2009). *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly: System-wide Coherence*. A/RES/63/311. United Nations General Assembly.
- United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Budget Committee Takes Up Report of Joint Inspection Unit, as It Begins Three-Week Resumed Session*. Department of Public Information: United Nations General Assembly. (GA/AB/3940).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Report of the Joint Inspection Unit for 2009 and Programme of Work for 2010*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/64/34).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/65/1).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2010). *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly [without reference to a Main Committee (A/64/L.56)], System-wide coherence*. General Assembly: United Nations. (A/RES/64/289).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2011). *Analysis of Funding for Activities for Development of the United Nations System for 2009, Report of the Secretary-General, Advanced Unedited Version*. General Assembly, Economic and Social Council: United Nations.
- United Nations General Assembly. (2011). *Report of the Joint Inspection Unit for 2010 and Programme of Work for 2011*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/65/34).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2008). *Programme Performance of the United Nations for the Biennium 2006-2007, Report of the Secretary –General*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/63/70).
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2010). *Proposed Modalities for the Establishment of an Independent System-wide Evaluation Mechanism: Comments by the Joint Inspection Unit – Informal Conference Room Paper*. United Nations Joint Inspection Unit.
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2011). *About JIU*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.unjiu.org/en/about.htm>.
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2011). *Current JIU Inspectors*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.unjiu.org/en/inspectors.htm>.
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2011). *Current JIU Staff Members*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.unjiu.org/en/staff.htm>.
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2011). *JIU Response to 5th Committee A/65/31 Annual Report for 2010 and PoW 2011*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations.
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2011). *JIU: Follow-up System on Reports*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.unjiu.org/en/followup.htm>.
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2011). *JIU: Participating Organizations*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.unjiu.org/en/partorgs.htm>.
- United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2011). *JIU: Statute of the Unit*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.unjiu.org/en/statute.htm>.
- United Nations Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination. *2007 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review*. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.un.org/esa/coordination/tcpr.htm#about>.
- United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services. (2007). *Assessment of Evaluation Capacities and Needs in the United Nations Secretariat*. Inspection and Evaluation Division: United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services. (Report No. IED-2006-006).
- United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services. (2009). *Internal Oversight*. Office of Internal Oversight Services: United Nations.

- United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services. (2009). *Investigations Manual*. Investigations Division: United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services.
- United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services. (2011). *Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the United Nations Office for Economic and Social Council Support and Coordination*. Inspection and Evaluation Division: United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services.
- United Nations Office of International Oversight Services. (2010). *Audit Report: UNHCR's Relationship with Implementing Partners*. Assignment No. AR2007/160/03. Internal Audit Division: United Nations Office of International Oversight Services.
- United Nations Office of International Oversight Services. (2003). *United Nations Internal Oversight*. United Nations Office of International Oversight Services.
- United Nations Office of International Oversight Services. (2010). *Audit Report: UNHCR Arrangements for Managing its Participation in the Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund*. Assignment No. AR2009/115/04. Internal Audit Division: United Nations Office of International Oversight Services.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2008). *Evaluation Handbook: A Practical Guide for Use by UNODC Staff to Plan, Manage and Follow-up an Evaluation*. Independent Evaluation Unit: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- United Nations Secretariat. (2009). *Strengthening Governance of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System for Enhanced System-wide Coherence – Discussion Note*. United Nations Secretariat. Retrieved 05 July 2011 from <http://www.un.org/ga/president/63/letters/sgswc160409.pdf>.
- United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice*. San Francisco: United Nations. Retrieved on 06 July 2011 from <http://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/CTC/uncharter.pdf>.
- United Nations. (2000). *Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation*, Secretary-General's bulletin. (ST/SGB/2000/8). United Nations Secretariat.
- United Nations. (2004). *A more secure world: Our shared responsibility Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change*. United Nations High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change.
- United Nations. (2005). *Managing for Results: A Guide to Using Evaluation in the United Nations Secretariat*. United Nations.
- United Nations. (2006). *Analytical Preparations for the 2007 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System, 2007 TCPR Draft Strategy*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs: United Nations.
- United Nations. (2006). *Delivering as One: Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel*. Secretary General's High-Level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance, and the Environment: United Nations.
- United Nations. (2007). *Conclusions of the Fourteenth Session of the High-Level Committee on Management*. Chief Executives Board for Coordination: United Nations. (CEB/2007/6).
- United Nations. (2007). *Establishing a UN-wide Evaluation System*. Chief Executives Board for Coordination: United Nations. (CEB/2007/HLCM/27).
- United Nations. (2007). *First Regular Session of 2007: Summary of Conclusions – Advance Unedited Version*. Chief Executives Board for Coordination: United Nations. (CEB/2007/1).
- United Nations. (2007). *Joint HLCM/HLCP Session*. Chief Executives Board for Coordination: United Nations. (CEB/2007/HLCM-HLCP/XIII/2).
- United Nations. (2008). *Establishing a UN-wide Evaluation System: Note by UNEG*. High-Level Committee on Management: Chief Executives Board for Coordination. (CEB/2008/HLCM/19).
- United Nations. (2008). *High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) Sixteenth Session: Provisional Annotated Agenda*. Chief Executives Board for Coordination: United Nations. (CEB/2008/HLCM/15).

- United Nations. (2008). *Management Process for the Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 62/208 on the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System, Report of the Secretary-General*. Economic and Social Council: United Nations. (E/2008/49).
- United Nations. (2008). *Report of the High-Level Committee on Programmes (HLCP) at its fifteenth Session*. Chief Executives Board for Coordination: United Nations. (CEB/2008/4).
- United Nations. (2008). *The United Nations Today*. Department of Public Information: United Nations.
- United Nations. (2009). *Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 63/311 on System-wide Coherence related to Operational Activities for Development*. United Nations General Assembly. (A/64/589).
- United Nations. (2009). *Results Achieved and Measures and Processes Implemented in Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 62/208 on the Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System Report of the Secretary-General*. Economic and Social Council: United Nations. (E/2009/68)
- United Nations. (2010). *Modalities for the Establishment of an Independent System-wide Evaluation Mechanism*. Office of the Secretary General: United Nations.
- United Nations. (2010). *Statement on behalf of the Joint Coordinating Committee of the Group 77 and China and the Non-Aligned Movement*. Joint Coordinating Committee: United Nations.
- United Nations. (2010). *The Evaluation Policy of UNDP*. DP/2011/3. United Nations: Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund.
- United Nations. (2011). *UN at a Glance*. United Nations. Retrieved on 06 July 2011 from <http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml>.
- United Nations. (2011). *United Nations Department of Public Information United Nations*. (DPI/2470—10-00133). Retrieved on 12 July 2011 from: http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/structure/pdfs/un_system_chart_colour_sm.pdf
- United States Mission to the United Nations. *Management and Reform Section*. Retrieved on 12 July 2011 from: http://usun.state.gov/about/un_reform/index.htm#
- Usher, J. (2003). *BNL Independent Oversight Office -FY 2003 Program Plan: Review of Organizational Self-Assessment Programs*. Retrieved 11 July from: www.io.bnl.gov/safy03.doc
- Yale Journal of International Affairs. (2011). *The U.S. Relationship with the United Nations Roundtable With Carol Bellamy, David Morrison, Christopher Shays*. Retrieved on 12 July 2011 from: <http://yalejournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/061207bellamy-morrison-shays.pdf>
- Zahran, M., Chulkov, N. and Inomata, T. (2010). *The Audit Function in the United Nations System*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/Rep/2010/5).
- Zahran, M., Roman-Morey, E. and Inomata, T. (2011). *South-South and Triangular Cooperation in the United Nations System*. Joint Inspection Unit: United Nations. (JIU/REP/2011/3). Retrieved 05 July 2011 from http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2011/JIU_REP_2011_03_Final.pdf

Appendix II List of Stakeholders Consulted During Work Plan Phase

Member States	
Name and Designation	Affiliation
Claude Lemioux, Counsellor (Development)	Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations
Ysabel Blanco, Second Secretary (Development)	Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations
SONG Shangzhe, Third Secretary	Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations
Jorge Cumberbatch, First Secretary	Permanent Mission of the Republic of Cuba to the United Nations
Jairo Rodriguez Hernandez, Attaché	Permanent Mission of the Republic of Cuba to the United Nations
Mohamed El Karakasy, First Secretary	Permanent Mission of Egypt to the United Nations
Noel Gonzalez Segura, Second Secretary	Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations
Gjermund Saether, Minister Counsellor	Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations
Alexander Alimov, Chief of Economic Division	Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations
Tatiana Zvereva, Senior Counsellor	Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations
Lizwi Nkombela, Counsellor (Economic)	Permanent Mission of the Republic of South Africa to the United Nations
Charlotta Schlyter, Counsellor	Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations
Tobias H. Glucksman, Advisor, Economic and Social Affairs	United States Mission to the United Nations
Stephen Ronaghan	United States Mission to the United Nations
Sharon Kinsley, First Secretary	Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations
Gastón Lasarte, Chairperson, Committee for Programmes and Coordination	Representative of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay

UN Secretariat	
Name and Designation	Affiliation
Parfait Onanga Anyanga, Director	Office of the Deputy Secretary-General
Masumi Ono, Economic Affairs Officer	Office of the Deputy Secretary-General
Nikhil Seth, Director	Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Marion Barthelemy, Chief, Development Co-operation Policy Branch	Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Kristinn Sv. Helgason, Deputy Chief, Development Co-operation Policy Branch	Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Lucien Back, Chief of the Secretariat to the Independent Evaluation of Delivering as One United Nations	Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Demetra Arapakos, Head of Evaluation, OIOS Inspection and Evaluation Office	Office of Internal Oversight Services
Scott Green, Chief, Evaluation Section	Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
United Nations Evaluation Group	
Name and Designation	Affiliation
Belan Sanz, Chief, Evaluation Office	UN Women and Current Chairperson of UNEG
Saraswathi Menon, Director	UNDP Evaluation Office and former Chairperson of UNEG
Joint Inspection Unit	
Name and Designation	Affiliation
Susanne Frueh, Executive Secretary	Joint Inspection Unit
Reference Group meeting	
Name and Designation	Affiliation
Juha Utto, Deputy Director, UNDP Evaluation Office	Representing UNEG Secretariat
Scott Green, Chief, Evaluation Section	Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
Kristinn Sv. Helgason, Deputy Chief, Development Co-operation	Department of Economic and Social Affairs

Final Work Plan

Policy Branch	
Demetra Arapakos, Head of Evaluation, OIOS Inspection and Evaluation Office	Office of Internal Oversight Services

Appendix III : Suggested list of additional interviewees

Note: Some individuals interviewed during the planning phase may be interviewed again if necessary.

UN Geneva	
Name / Designation	Affiliation
Inspectors	Joint Inspection Unit
Susanne Frueh, Executive Secretary	Joint Inspection Unit
Evaluation and Inspection Officers	Joint Inspection Unit
	Ambassador, Mission of India to United Nations in Geneva
Carla Henry, OIC	International Labour Organization Evaluation Office
David Webb, Director, OIS	WHO Evaluation Office
Deepak Thapa	WHO Evaluation Office
Yuen Ching Ho	UNCTAD Evaluation Office
Jennifer Worrell	OHCHR Evaluation Office
Jeff Crisp	UNHCR Evaluation Office
Paul de Lay	UNAIDS Evaluation Office
Remo Lalli	CEB Secretariat
UN New York and other	
Name / Designation	Affiliation
Deputy Secretary-General	UN Secretariat
Oscar Garcia, Evaluation Adviser	UNDP Evaluation Office
Colin Kirk, Head	UNICEF Evaluation Office
Marco Segone	UNICEF Evaluation Office
	UNFPA Evaluation Office
Director	OIOS
	UNEP Evaluation Office
Debra Landey	DOCO
Caroline Heider	WFP
John Fitzsimmons	Internal Audit, FAO
Change Management Team	UN Secretariat
Helen Clarke, Chairperson	UN Development Group
Phyllis Lee	CEB – High Level Committee on Programmes

Member States	
Name / Designation	Affiliation
Chairperson	5 th Committee
	Advisory Committee on Accounts and Budgeting
Yisheng Ren (5 th Committee)	Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations
Maria Nilhaus Taup	Permanent Mission of Denmark to the United Nations
Namgya Khampa, First Secretary	Permanent Mission of the Republic of India to the United Nations
5 th Committee representative	Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations
Mamadou Mbodji, Second Secretary	Permanent Mission of the Republic of Senegal to the United Nations
Motumisi Tewana (5 th Committee)	Permanent Mission of the Republic of South Africa to the United Nations
Nicolas Weeks	Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations
Case studies, models and analogies, other	
Name / Designation	Affiliation
Henk van der Westhuizen, Director, International Cooperation	Department for International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa
Sheldon Moulton, Director, Economic Development	Department for International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa
Mashwale Diphofa, Director-General	Office of the Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa
Ann Routier	Canadian Centre of Excellence for Evaluation
Martha Ainsworth, Acting Director General (Senior Economist)	World Bank Independent Evaluation Group
Eileen Merritt	US Government Audit Office
Mohamed Menai	African Development Bank
Carol Logan	Former Director Evaluation, ILO
Richard Manning	DFID
Finbar O'Brien	Ireland
Ted Cleese	Netherlands
Jean Quesnel	Canada

Appendix IV Definitions of key terms

Term	Definition
Appraisal	A critical assessment of the potential value of an undertaking before a decision is made to implement it.
Audit	An assessment of the adequacy of management controls to ensure the economical and efficient use of resources; the safeguarding of assets; the reliability of financial and other information; the compliance with regulations, rules and established policies; the effectiveness of risk management; and the adequacy of organizational structures, systems and processes.
Capacity	This is defined as the ability to carry out an independent system wide evaluation.
Evaluation	An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance etc. It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or lack thereof. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the organizations of the UN system. An evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of the organizations of the UN system and its members. ⁴
Governance Arrangement	This is defined as the authorizing environment which provides the legitimacy of an organization or group to carry out its work.
Independence	An evaluation function has to be located independently from the other management functions so that it is free from undue influence and that unbiased and transparent reporting is ensured. It needs to have full discretion in submitting its reports for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making pertaining to the subject of the evaluation. ⁵
Institutional framework for system wide evaluation	This represents the rules under which independent system wide evaluation operates. Such rules are made explicit in mandates, policies, values, norms, beliefs, structures, finance, partnerships etc.
Inspection	A general examination that seeks to identify vulnerable areas and malfunctions and to propose corrective action.
Internal management consulting	Consulting services to help managers implement changes that address organizational and managerial challenges and improve internal work processes
Investigation	A specific examination of a claim of wrongdoing and provision of evidence for eventual prosecution or disciplinary measures.

⁴ UNEG Norms and Standards

⁵ UNEG Norms and Standards

Term	Definition
Monitoring	Management's continuous examination of progress achieved during the implementation of an undertaking to track compliance with the plan and to take necessary decisions to improve performance.
Operational activities for development	Operational activities for development are defined as UN system activities financed from official development assistance (ODA). ⁶ Operational activities for development include both development-related activities and humanitarian assistance of the UN system.
Research	A systematic examination designed to develop or contribute to knowledge.
Review	The periodic or ad hoc often rapid assessments of the performance of an undertaking that does not apply the due process of evaluation. Reviews tend to emphasize operational issues.
System-wide	System-wide refers to all relevant member organisations of the UN system involved in a specific area, effort, issues or sector, at country/regional/global level. It usually implies a focus on how effectively the different parts of the system are working together.

⁶ In the case of the normative specialized agencies, the share of assessed contributions defined as operational activities for development is generally determined in consultations between the respective UN entity and OECD/DAC.

Appendix V Self Assessment Questionnaire



OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY-GENERAL

“Comprehensive review of existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation of operational activities for development of the United Nations system”

Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Completed by:

Organization:	
Division/Unit:	
Name:	
Title:	
Date:	

This self-assessment questionnaire to be completed by members of the United Nations Evaluation Group is commissioned by the Office of the Deputy Secretary-General as part of a review of the existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation of operational activities for development, mandated in GA resolution 64/289. The review is expected to provide recommendations to Member States on how to further strengthen the system-wide evaluation (SWE) function in the work of the UN system.

Mandate and governance	
1. Does your current mandate allow your office to conduct, manage and/or contribute to system-wide evaluations? ⁷ (Please check as many as apply)	Yes, to conduct Yes, to manage Yes, to contribute <input type="checkbox"/> No
1a. Please cite the mandates and specify and explain your answer above:	
2. Do your current governance arrangements allow your office to conduct, manage and/or contribute to system-wide evaluations? (Check as many as apply)	Yes, to conduct Yes, to manage Yes, to contribute <input type="checkbox"/> No

⁷ System-wide refers to all relevant member organisations of the UN system involved in a specific area, effort, issues or sector, at country/regional/global level. It usually implies a focus on how effectively the different parts of the system are working together.

2a. Please explain your answer above:	
3. What in your view are the important system-wide issues that need to be addressed by a “system-wide evaluation mechanism”?	
3a. Please identify reports that in your view are related to system-wide evaluation	
Participation in system-wide evaluations	
4. Has your office ever participated in any way in a system-wide evaluation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (Skip to question 10)
5. How many over the past 5 years?	
6. What role(s) did your office play in the system-wide evaluation(s)? (Check as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Conducted the SWE <input type="checkbox"/> Managed the SWE <input type="checkbox"/> Contributed to the SWE <input type="checkbox"/> Played some other role (Please explain)
7. How was independence of the system-wide evaluation(s) protected, if at all?	
8. What governance arrangements were in place for the system-wide evaluation(s)?	
9. Briefly describe your experience (positive and negative) in participating in system-wide evaluations including lessons learned	
10. Would your office have interest in participating in a system-wide evaluation in the future? (Check as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to conduct the SWE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to manage the SWE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, to contribute to the SWE <input type="checkbox"/> No
Capacity and resources	
11. If your office was asked to contribute to a system-wide evaluation, what capacity and resources, if any, would you have to do this? (Check as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> One or more full-time staff members to work on the SWE team <input type="checkbox"/> One or more part-time staff members to work on the SWE team <input type="checkbox"/> Advisory role <input type="checkbox"/> Funds for SWE consultants <input type="checkbox"/> Some other contribution (Please explain)
12. In your opinion, do staff in your office have the necessary competencies to participate in a system-wide evaluation? Please explain your answer	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Professional staff in EO consist of highly qualified evaluation experts
13. In your opinion, does your office have the necessary independence to participate in a system-wide evaluation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

14. What value added do you think your office could bring to a system-wide evaluation?	
15. What current limitations do you have that would prevent you from participating in a system-wide evaluation?	
16. What final comments would you like to make about the ability of your office to participate in a system-wide evaluation?	
17. What do you see as the institutional and organizational strengths and weaknesses of the UN system to engage in and use “system wide evaluations”?	

For further information, please contact:

Masumi Ono
Office of the Deputy Secretary-General
United Nations
Email: ono@un.org
Tel.: 1-917-367-4096

Appendix VI Interview Guide

1. Background

The Office of the Deputy Secretary-General contracted Dr. Charles Lusthaus and Ms. Angela Bester to constitute a Review team to conduct an assessment of the existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation at the UN. This was mandated in GA resolution 64/289 and is expected to provide recommendations to Member States on how to further strengthen this important function in the work of the UN system. The establishment of an independent system-wide evaluation (ISWE) mechanism within the UN system should also be aimed at fully utilizing and strengthening the existing institutional framework and capacities.

The main purpose of this interview protocol is to obtain the perceptions of Key Stakeholders on the issues surrounding ISWE. In addition, the interview would have two further purposes. First to identify key documents-national-international or within the UN that would provide the review team with insight into ISWE. Second to identify important interviewees who might have specialized insight into ISWE.

2. Interview Questions and Prompts

- 1) What has been the history of ISWE in the UN?
 - Within JIU, Board of auditors
 - Within UNEG, DESA, OCHA, OIOS
 - Other
- 2) What is your understanding of the concepts?
 - Independent evaluation-system wide evaluation-
- 3) What is the rationale for ISWE?
 - What is the demand for ISWE? Who is making this demand? What are the perceived uses for ISWE?
 - What are the governing bodies that would use ISWE—for what type of decisions?
 - What are the risks and opportunities that ISWE pose?
- 4) What constitutes the Institutions that compose the ISWE? What is meant by a comprehensive review of existing institutional framework for system-wide evaluation of operational activities for development?
 - Existing institutional framework for system wide evaluation?
 - Agencies, plus UNEG, DESA< OCHA< JIU, OIOS
 - What needs to be known about the existing institutional framework for system wide evaluation
- 5) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the existing system?
 - Governance, leadership, strategy, structure, staffing, program work, funding, quality concerns, horizontal coordination
 - What are the existing capacities (strengths) and concerns (weaknesses) related to the ISW evaluation function within the UN today

- 6) Is anything missing? What should the mandate of such a unit be?
 - Identify some system wide issues you think-such a unit should evaluate? E.g. UN delivering as one, the degree to which gender equity is supported and advocated throughout the system
- 7) What would constitute a good ISWE mechanism?
 - E.g. independent, credible, useful to improve UN
- 8) What are the capacities needed for the ISWE to be a good mechanism?
 - Legal or policy framework, access to information, access to staff and external HR, access to finance, authority structure, coordinating relationships
- 9) What documents ought we to read?
- 10) What other people should we interview?

Appendix VII Institutional Evaluation Respondents

Questionnaire Respondent's Organisations and Divisions:

1. Department of Public Information, Evaluation and Communications Research Unit
2. FAO, Office of Evaluation (OED)
3. ILO, Evaluation Unit
4. Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Evaluation Section
5. Office of Internal Oversight Service, Inspection and Evaluation Division
6. Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, Office of Internal Oversight (OIO)
7. UN Women, Evaluation Office (EO)
8. UNDP, Evaluation Office (EO)
9. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Evaluation Office
10. UNESCO, IOS
11. UNIDO, ODG/EVA
12. UNRWA, Department of Internal Oversight Services
13. United Nations Volunteers, Evaluation Unit
14. WHO, Office of Internal Oversight Services
15. World Meteorological Organization, Internal Oversight Office (IOO)
16. UN ESCWA, PPTCD
17. INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD), IFAD's INDEPENDENT OFFICE OF EVALUATION
18. UN Office of Internal Oversight Services, Inspection and Evaluation Division
19. WIPO, Evaluation Section
20. WFP, Office of Evaluation
21. DESA, OESC/DCPB
22. Joint Inspection Unit
23. UNODC, UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit