

REPORT ON EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

Prepared
by
Earl D. Sohm
Joint Inspection Unit

Geneva
March 1977

FOREWORD

The Inspector wishes to acknowledge with appreciation the contribution of many to this report, both from within and without the United Nations system, and, of course, the other Inspectors of the Joint Inspection Unit.

Table of Contents

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1-6	i-ii
I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	7-32	1-6
II. THE CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM	33-41	7-8
III. POTENTIAL PROBLEMS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS	42-61	9-12
A. Expectations	43-44	9
B. Top-level support	45	9
C. Feasibility of evaluation	46	9
D. Resources	47-49	10
E. Training	50-51	10
F. Relationship between the activities of the United Nations system and those of Governments	52-53	10-11
G. Relationship between field operations and headquarters activities	54	11
H. Diverse approaches to evaluation by United Nations organizations	55-57	11
I. The choice of activities for evaluation ..	58-59	11-12
J. Support activities for evaluation	60-61	12
IV. THE USE OF EVALUATION IN THE FUTURE	62-97	13-24
A. The suggested approach	62-63	13
B. Definition of evaluation	64-72	13-15
C. Organizational responsibilities	73-75	15
D. Tentative guidelines or principles for internal evaluation	76-90	16-22
E. The role of the Joint Inspection Unit in evaluation	91-93	22
F. The potential benefits of evaluation in the United Nations system	94-97	23-24

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	1-20	25-28
A. Conclusions	1-17	25-27
B. Recommendations	18-20	27-28
<u>Annex I</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE UN	1-7	i-ii
<u>Annex II</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY UNIDO	1-9	i-iii
<u>Annex III</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY UNDP	1-6	i-ii
<u>Annex IV</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY FAO	1-7	i-iii
<u>Annex V</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY IAEA	1-3	i
<u>Annex VI</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY ICAO	1-4	i
<u>Annex VII</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE ILO	1-8	i-iii
<u>Annex VIII</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY IMCO	1-5	i
<u>Annex IX</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY ITU	1-7	i
<u>Annex X</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY UNESCO	1-11	i-iii
<u>Annex XI</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY UPU	1-7	i
<u>Annex XII</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY WHO	1-9	i-iii
<u>Annex XIII</u> - CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY WMO	1-8	i-ii
<u>Annex XIV</u> - STEPS IN EVALUATION		i-ii

INTRODUCTION

1. The main purpose of this report is to outline the current status of evaluation in the United Nations system and to make suggestions to use in the future. In its Statute approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) was given the following responsibilities for evaluation, effective January 1978:

"... Without prejudice to the principle that external evaluation remains the responsibility of appropriate inter-governmental bodies, the Unit, with due regard to its other responsibilities, may assist them in carrying out their responsibilities for external evaluation of programmes and activities. On its own initiative or at the request of the executive heads, the Unit may also advise organizations on their methods for internal evaluation, periodically assess these methods and make ad hoc evaluations of programmes and activities." ^{1/}

2. The Economic and Social Council (EGOSOC) set forth at its sixtieth session the terms of reference of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC)^{2/} which includes the following:

"Consider and develop evaluation procedures and their use in the improvement of programme design ...

The Joint Inspection Unit shall also bring to the attention of the Committee any problem which it considers important within the scope of the Committee's responsibilities."

In view of the above, this report is addressed not only to the participating organizations of the JIU, but also to the CPC.

3. The JIU believes that the first and most useful undertaking in the field of evaluation would be to find out what is going on now in the United Nations system, and to attempt to determine what should be done in the future. This report gives a brief history of evaluation in the United Nations system and attempts to describe in summary form the current status of evaluation in all of the principal United Nations agencies. It also attempts to describe some of the outstanding problems in the field of evaluation and tries to put in proper perspective the very high expectations anticipated from evaluation. Some conclusions are drawn and actions recommended. In addition, some preliminary suggestions have been included on evaluation guidelines, common principles, etc. which the JIU hopes will form the basis for discussions among the agencies, so that accepted evaluation patterns and systems may be established by United Nations organizations.

4. This report is based upon visits by the Inspector to the headquarters of many participating organizations, on documents and papers provided by the organizations and on informal meetings in Geneva with representatives of some of the organizations. The Inspector was pleased to note that, although there is a general recognition that past efforts for internal evaluation have been inadequate, most organizations are prepared to improve their methods and some

^{1/} General Assembly Resolution 31/192 of 22 December 1976, Annex, Article 5, paragraph 4.

^{2/} EGOSOC Resolution 2008 (LX), Annex.

have already begun to do so. All organizations contacted agreed to collaborate with the JIU in this effort. Finally, the Inspector found that, in most organizations, particularly the larger ones, there was a genuine acceptance of the need to introduce or improve evaluation methods as a major contribution towards more effective management action and more realistic programming. The problem is how to do so.

5. The conclusions and recommendations made in this report should be considered in the context of certain general features of the United Nations system. These are:

(a) The organizations that make up the United Nations system are now spending each year well over \$ 2 billion;

(b) Each organization devotes a significant part of its resources to planning and programming and to reporting, but relatively little effort is given to determining the impact of work accomplished. Information and reporting systems produce voluminous documents at high cost, but these documents do not permit a judgement, in comparison with approved plans, of the quantity of work accomplished, nor of its quality;

(c) In relation to its size and budget, the United Nations system does relatively little evaluation.

6. This report, prepared within certain time constraints, should be looked upon as only the first of a series of steps and actions which need to be taken in order to develop eventually effective evaluation systems, both internal and external, within the United Nations structure.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

7. Evaluation is not a new concept or activity in national or international organizations; in one sense, we have always had evaluation of a sort. It has been a subject of special interest for almost 20 years in the United Nations and was first discussed in connexion with technical co-operation efforts. During its initial stages, administrators made reports on programmes or projects and, in most cases, these were looked upon as a form of evaluation or assessment. Usually, however, they were fragmentary and subjective. In many cases, they were a judgement of one person or a group, and others might have drawn entirely different conclusions. Evaluation techniques have become more sophisticated over a period of time as a result of experimentation and adaptation to various types of projects and programmes. Nonetheless, it is interesting to observe some aspects of the global development of evaluation in the United Nations system.

8. One of the early developments was in 1949, when ECOSOC adopted a resolution which charged the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC) with the critical examination of activities and results of such activities undertaken by the enlarged Technical Assistance Programme (TAP). ^{3/} As early as 1951, the Secretary-General drew attention "to the need for an attempt to evaluate the results of technical assistance". He added in his report that he hoped "to be able to use the resources at his disposal to prepare for the Council material to enable it to evaluate the results of technical assistance in each country in which the programme has been in operation". ^{4/}

9. In 1952, the Secretary-General said that "An over-all assessment of the achievements of the technical assistance programme in both economic and social fields can, however, best be made by an organization responsible for all aspects of the programme. It would therefore seem appropriate that the Technical Assistance Board should include in its increasing responsibilities the duty of evaluating the results of the programme as a whole". ^{5/} The TAB, in its 1956 report, added for the first time a section entitled "Evaluation" which reviewed technical assistance projects. Every year until 1962, the members of the TAC discussed this chapter on evaluation in the TAB report and drew attention to any particular point in the report which seemed to them essential.

10. In 1962, at its thirty-fourth session, ECOSOC (TAC) was still concerned with devising an approach to evaluation. In that session, several members indicated that "there was a need for a new approach to evaluation which would provide the Committee with first-hand information on shortcomings, as well as success achieved". These members felt that "evaluation should ... be more critical in its approach" and point towards steps aimed at "improving the programme and correcting any undesirable trends". ^{6/}

11. The thirty-fourth session then adopted a resolution (908 (XXXIV)) which recognized that present arrangements for the evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of the programmes were inadequate and called upon the Secretary-General and the executive heads of all the specialized agencies to give particular attention to the matter of continuous effective evaluation of the programmes.

^{3/} ECOSOC Resolution 222 A (IX) of 15 August 1949, paragraph 6(a).

^{4/} Report by Secretary-General, E/2001 of 6 June 1951, paragraphs 14 and 15.

^{5/} Report by Secretary-General, E/2209 of 21 April 1952, paragraph 17.

^{6/} Document E/3680 of 27 July 1962, p. 9, paragraph 25.

12. The ECOSOC adopted a resolution (991 (XXXVI)) at its thirty-sixth session in 1963 which expressed the hope that the appropriate organs of the United Nations and the agencies would continue and intensify their efforts at technical evaluation of their programmes and operations. It was decided that greater attention should be centred on an evaluation of the overall impact on the development of the combined programmes of the United Nations system of organizations in terms of performance and results achieved. The thirty-sixth session also requested the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) to give further consideration to certain problems relating to evaluation and to report on the results to the 1964 session of the Council. The results of the ACC's consideration showed the inherent difficulty in making evaluations of United Nations programmes which form only a comparatively small part of a total programme of the national government.

13. The ACC, after careful consideration of the questions involved, reached the conclusion that no overall evaluation of the impact of the United Nations programmes in the economic, social and related fields, could be expected to lead to any precise results because there are no financial or other statistical figures which could be given in order to establish a precise measure of their impact. The ACC felt that this statement would be true in the case of anyone who attempts such an evaluation "no matter how skilled he may be, no matter how much time he may have at his disposal and no matter how complete his access to the facts." 7/

14. The ACC went on to say that trying to evaluate the impact of United Nations projects, even in the economic sphere, is "really trying to judge the effectiveness of a trigger mechanism; the results made possible are not in proportion to the mechanism itself, and no measure of these results, however precise, is a true measure of the isolated value of the trigger" 8/. Thus, problems of evaluation and resources were made evident.

15. In April 1964, when the ACC came back into session, the general opinion was that only the government of a developing country could effectively evaluate the true progress made in economic and social fields as a result of United Nations contributions. On 15 August 1964, ECOSOC adopted a resolution (1042 (XXXVII)), asking the Secretary-General to do everything possible for undertaking pilot evaluation projects.

16. The report of the Special Committee on Co-ordination of ECOSOC declared in July 1964 that it favoured a policy of "hastening slowly" in the field of evaluation 9/. The Committee felt that a great deal of discussion on the importance and the problems of evaluating the overall impact of United Nations programmes had already taken place and that it would now be desirable to concentrate constructive efforts on the implementation of concrete proposals for action, so as to achieve as soon as possible some first tangible, if limited, results 10/.

17. In 1964, ECOSOC again was active in the field of evaluation of programmes and concluded once more that any evaluation of the impact of technical co-operation programmes was of primary concern to the countries involved and required the co-operation of the governments concerned. It endorsed the concept.

7/ Co-ordination/R.455, p. 6, paragraph 12.

8/ Co-ordination/R.455, p. 8, paragraph 16.

9/ Document E/3946 of 13 July 1964, p. 3, paragraph 8.

10/ Idem.

of pilot evaluation projects 11/. Later, having taken note of the Secretary-General's report on the two pilot evaluation missions in Chile and Thailand, the Council adopted a resolution in 1965 (1092 (XXXIX)) which drew the attention of interested organizations and governments to the Secretary-General's suggestion that evaluation become an integral part of all operational activities.

18. ECOSOC in its forty-first session (July-August 1966) endorsed the establishment of an Interagency Study Group on Evaluation by the ACC. The primary but not exclusive function of this Group was to examine the reports of the evaluation teams and to propose practical steps for making the operation of the technical assistance programmes more effective. The Interagency Study Group held its first meeting in Geneva on 19 and 20 September 1966. It met again later that year and early in 1967. It considered the reports of the evaluation teams and held preliminary discussions on points of interagency interest, choice of countries, timing of missions, composition of teams, methods and techniques of evaluation, etc. It also made arrangements for the preparation of a consolidated report on existing practices of United Nations organizations with regard to the evaluation of programmes and projects of technical assistance co-operation 12/.

19. In its 1967 session, the Council adopted resolution 1263 (XLIII) in which it asked that the Interagency Study Group on Evaluation continue its work and study in particular the experts', technical consultants' and mission chiefs' reports, making sure that these were usable. The Council also asked ACC to report in 1968 on the work of the Study Group and to give its comments and recommendations on the evaluation missions. It asked the Secretary-General himself to put forward a report at its 1968 session on the pilot evaluation missions undertaken in 1967 and the beginning of 1968. Finally, the Council considered the plan of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) to do a report on ways to develop the best methods and techniques for evaluating projects.

20. In 1968, the Council expressed its satisfaction with the reports of the Secretary-General, ACC and UNITAR on evaluation 13/. It asked the Secretary-General to prepare a document which would describe the major points of a general evaluation policy, as well as practical problems, such as the establishment of definitions and methods, and to formulate his conclusions and recommendations for setting up a coherent evaluation programme for projects and programmes in the technical co-operation field, in order to facilitate the task of the Second United Nations Development Decade in determining its objectives.

21. At this time, evaluation studies were basically concentrated on the results obtained by programmes. The criteria governing the programmes and projects had not been established according to the real or basic needs for developing countries and it became obvious that there was a need for a systematic and in-depth evaluation even at this early stage. In 1966, the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts for the Examination of the Finances of the United Nations Organizations and the Specialized Agencies stated that "over-all evaluation consists in estimating the scope, cost and potential effectiveness of a project or programme before a decision is taken on it, checking the estimates and performance during

11/ Document E/3946 of 13 July 1964, p. 3, paragraph 8.

12/ Co-ordination/R.593 of 24 February 1967.

13/ ECOSOC Resolution 1364 (XLV).

its execution, and determining the cost and the results achieved when the project or programme is finally completed." 14/

22. In 1968, the Interagency Study Group on Evaluation recalled that ACC had indicated that priority attention should be given to establishing standard definitions for terms used in connexion with evaluation. During the general discussion of this problem, the Study Group focused its attention on the definition of the term "evaluation" itself. There was general agreement that a basic consideration in the definition was that evaluation should be in the context of stated plans and objectives 15/.

23. In a report in 1968, the ACC indicated that opportunities arising for evaluation should be more fully utilized than had been the case in the past among all United Nations agencies. The ACC noted the operative paragraph 4(b) of resolution 12.1 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its fourteenth session. In this paragraph it was stated that the term "evaluation" should be reserved "for those studies that permit a rigorous scientific measurement of the effects of a project or activity; for studies that do not meet this criterion, it would be preferable to use some such term as 'assessment'".

24. In 1969, the Interagency Study Group on Evaluation stated that the multiplicity of evaluation aspects had led to some confusion. However, they drew the following conclusions:

"(a) It is generally agreed that each agency and programme should develop its own evaluation techniques and procedures in order to assess the efficiency with which it carries out its programmes and projects. This holds true for all activities carried out by the organizations, while limitations in terms of manpower, techniques, cost, etc. may prevent them from developing evaluation in some sectors or at some levels;

(b) At the same time, there is a need at a central point, for interagency action, in order to carry out in an appropriate manner the following functions:

- (i) to co-ordinate evaluation processes when a project concerns several agencies;
- (ii) to compare the methods used by the different agencies and programmes in evaluating their respective activities so that all organizations may benefit from the experience of each of them;
- (iii) to undertake research in a co-ordinated way as a considerable amount of research is indispensable in this rather new field;
- (iv) to develop further the glossary of terms and to elaborate a common framework of reference;
- (v) to aim at developing a more rational and coherent system of evaluation within the United Nations system, as has been insistently requested by the Council;

14/ Document A/6343, p. 74, paragraph 74.

15/ Co-ordination/R.648, p. 2, paragraph 6.

(vi) if need arises, to develop such activities not only for technical co-operation, but also other programmes of the United Nations and the agencies;

(c) Co-ordination in the field of evaluation cannot easily be confined to "co-ordination" in a limited sense, but has to deal also with technical and substantive aspects." 16/

25. The last meeting of the Interagency Study Group on Evaluation which took place in Geneva in February 1972, at the invitation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), reviewed a draft set of guidelines for the evaluation of UNDP-assisted projects and UNDP country programmes as a whole. These later were incorporated with modifications into the UNDP Policies and Procedures Manual issued in 1975. The Study Group generally endorsed the UNDP approaches with respect to project and country programme evaluations. It also commended the approaches for adoption in the United Nations development system as a whole. The ACC felt that the guidelines constituted a flexible and practicable management tool which would extend and reinforce the agencies' own evaluation systems. The Study Group concluded this session with an indication that they should meet again when sufficient experience in the application of the new guidelines had been gained, so that there could be a fruitful review at that time.

26. The period of life of the Interagency Study Group - 1966-1972 - might be considered as a high-point in terms of United Nations interest in evaluation. During this same period, UNITAR began work on evaluation and issued a report in 1971 on criteria and methods of evaluation 17/. Interest ebbed shortly after that, but only briefly, since there continued to be expressions of need for better evaluation systems and techniques.

27. In his study in 1969 on the Capacity of the United Nations Development System, Sir Robert Jackson noted that there appeared to be unanimous agreement that present evaluation procedures were neither well-defined, nor satisfactory. He also noted that evaluation is indispensable in order to guarantee an effective use of resources and to account for their use. It was obvious to him, however, that the present uncoordinated way in which it was being carried out represented a serious drain on capacity and therefore a more systematic approach must be introduced as a matter of urgency 18/.

28. Sir Robert Jackson observed that there had been a recent increase in governments' interest in evaluation because the major contributors to the various voluntarily-financed development co-operation activities had raised questions as to whether they were getting "value for money". Some developing countries also asked for evaluations or had requested assistance in setting up efficient evaluation units staffed with qualified people. The increase in interest in evaluation appeared to be directly related to the growth of resources available to the United Nations development system 19/.

16/ Co-ordination/R.765/Add.4, paragraph 17.

17/ UN Development Aid: Criteria and Methods of Evaluation, Arno Press, 1971.

18/ A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System: DP/5, Volume II, Chapter III, paragraphs 118 and 121.

19/ Idem. Volume II, Chapter V, paragraph 142.

29. Sir Robert Jackson stated that a unified system of evaluation must conform to established principles but it should allow for the divergencies in techniques necessary for different types of projects. Whenever evaluation is carried out within the system, the same basic approach should apply as regards purpose, timing and organization 20/.

30. In summary, during the period from 1966 to 1972, efforts were made to add precision to terms and techniques, but there was never a full development of methods of evaluation which incorporated objective, systematic and comprehensive techniques. In the meantime, these were developing in some governments and in the private sector. After a brief ebbing of interest in the United Nations, there was a revival, with expressions of need for evaluation systems and techniques. For example, in 1975, there were two reports which called attention to the need for more systematic evaluation of the activities of the organizations of the United Nations system and suggested that the JIU play a role in such evaluation 21/. In addition, the governing organs of all the larger organizations stressed at this time the need for better and more systematic evaluation. Then, in late 1976, the General Assembly entrusted the JIU with specific responsibilities in evaluation.

31. Throughout this period, there appeared to be no clear and precise definition of the term evaluation, and this problem continues today, although the need for a definition has been recognized for some time. Often, however, each organization places the label "evaluation" on whatever it is doing, in order to qualify itself as undertaking evaluation under the current resurgence of the popularity of evaluation. Most recently, the Task Force of the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions (CCAQ) noted " ... a need to develop a common understanding of evaluation, and possibly also common evaluation techniques and standards, throughout the United Nations system." 22/

32. The possibilities of evaluation in the United Nations system are at a "take-off" point. The interest is high, the demands from governing bodies and member States are insistent and the need for leadership, clarification and organization within each of the United Nations bodies is clear. However, a note of warning should be added. Interest in evaluation in United Nations organizations tends to rise and fall; at the moment it is encouraging to note that it is at one of its high-points, but the expectations from the results of evaluation may indeed be too high.

20/ A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System; DP/5, Volume II, Chapter V, paragraph 151.

21/ Report of the Working Group on United Nations Programme and Budget Machinery; A/10L17 of 17 June 1975; paragraph 69 and; Report of the Group of Experts on the Structure of the United Nations system; E/AC.62/9 of 28 May 1975; paragraph 132.

22/ CCAQ/S.46/R.2 (FB), p. 8.

II. THE CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

33. At present, evaluation is more an idea in the minds of enlightened administrators than an established, well-understood pattern and practice. With a few exceptions, there is very little evaluation being done by United Nations organizations that would meet any acceptable definition or agreed common principles or guidelines. Also, those organizations that have made a start on evaluation have done so independently with little or no consultation with other organizations. As a result, the efforts so far have little in common, are not yet compatible and systematic and, in most cases, have technical shortcomings. As a result, inter-agency comparisons of results which would facilitate the work of such bodies as the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) are not possible.

34. A summary description of the practices of organizations in the area of evaluation is given for each organization in Annexes I to XIII. (These have been reviewed by each organization). A brief assessment of these practices is also made for each organization. Based upon these summaries, the JIU will next seek more detailed information regarding the use of evaluation techniques in each of the agencies in order to prepare a supplementary review of the current practices in the organizations.

35. Many United Nations organizations are doing work that they call evaluation. But little of this work would as yet qualify as evaluation. It does not meet most of the principles suggested for evaluation in Part IV-D of this report. All organizations are searching for, but very few have developed, principles and methods which could help make their internal evaluation work more effective.

36. There is little or no co-ordination among individual organizations in establishing or improving their internal evaluation systems. Except for the rudimentary evaluation of UNDP-assisted projects done under the guidance of UNDP, which is often more a reporting than an evaluation system, there are no compatible guidelines or principles used by the organizations. There are wide disparities in organizational arrangements and in the amount of resources devoted to evaluation.

37. A few organizations are making significant progress towards developing viable internal evaluation processes, notably WHO, FAO, and more recently, ILO. However, they recognize that they are still far from having an effective system.

38. The smaller organizations maintain that they are doing evaluation, but in fact seem to be doing only what they did in the past, while applying to this work the term evaluation. An evaluation system, although needed in any organization, will have to be tuned to the needs, size and resources of each particular organization.

39. As there is no agreed definition of evaluation or common understanding of evaluation, each organization tends to include different activities under this term. A very few limit the use of the word evaluation to activities in which results are systematically compared against objectives; most use a broader definition comprising activities such as reporting or monitoring.

40. Some elements which organizations place under the general heading of evaluation are as follows:

- Project and programme reviews
(Comprising: - project reviews;
- programme reviews;
- country reviews;
- global reviews, e.g. annual reviews of the programme of work of a given organization).
- Reporting and information systems parallel to the above;
- In-depth reviews of specific programmes;
- Organizational studies;
- Programme-budget reviews (i.e. budget performance reports or implementation reports), including cost-measurement, cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis;
- The executive head's annual (or biennial) report on the activities of the organization.

41. Less precise activities which can be important in making up evaluation are:

- internal and external auditing;
- management auditing;
- inspection;
- monitoring;
- assessment;
- control;
- appraisal.

III. POTENTIAL PROBLEMS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS.

42. The review of the current use of evaluation by organizations of the United Nations system has permitted the identification of a number of potential problems which are described below, together with observations on how these problems may be gradually resolved.

A. Expectations

43. There is little doubt that inter-governmental bodies and member States are deeply concerned about whether or not activities are being carried out in accordance with their directives. The numerous and voluminous reports they receive do little to assuage this feeling or to help them make rational decisions regarding policy and resource allocations. Since the scope and content of evaluation is not yet clearly understood, since evaluation requires effort and resources not anticipated or available at the start, and since it depends on the clarity and precision with which objectives are stated in the programming process, a condition not yet fully realized, it is not surprising that evaluation as practised in the United Nations system has not yet lived up to the expectations placed on it by its proponents.

44. But the potential contribution of evaluation to improving both the planning and execution of programmes and to better utilization of resources and possibly reduced costs, are now well recognized. However, because of the extreme complexity of the activities of the United Nations system, because resources for evaluation are inadequate, because staff trained in evaluation techniques are insufficient in number and because there is a lack of understanding of evaluation and therefore some resistance to it, it is important for all concerned to realize that results will continue to be modest for some time. It will be only after guidelines and principles are developed, systematic methodologies introduced by each organization and necessary minimum resources made available, that evaluation could make its full contribution.

B. Top-level support

45. Effective evaluation requires continuing top-level support. Governing bodies and management should call for and consider evaluation findings and recommendations when making decisions and allocating resources if evaluation is to be truly worthwhile, otherwise cynics will view it as just another "exercise" and will give it only lip service.

C. Feasibility of evaluation

46. Evaluation is not an exact science but there are certain fundamentals which determine the degree of evaluability. These are the need for specific and clear objectives and results expected. There should also be an indication of resources to be used and accomplishments expected over a set period of time. These fundamentals help ensure more effective evaluations. It should not be assumed, however, that their absence, although severely limiting, would necessarily preclude any form of evaluation.

D. Resources

47. Results can be obtained only after an initial investment is made to develop common guidelines and methodologies, and to train staff. If a gradual approach is decided upon for the introduction of evaluation - and this seems to be the most feasible approach - then it should be possible for most organizations to make the necessary investment by using resources diverted from existing related activities.

48. The principal existing related activities are the programme planning process, the management information systems and the reporting systems. By using the resources available for these systems, it would be possible to re-orient them and build them into an integrated system which embraces evaluation. Suggestions on how this might be done are made in Part IV-D of this report. The actual operation of an evaluation system will, of course, require some resources for staff, consultants and travel, but if evaluation begins on a selective rather than a comprehensive basis and if resources are made available from other systems, the additional cost will not be large.

49. Evaluation processes should be developed which are practical in scope and recognize budgetary and organizational limitations. Evaluation should not be regarded as an end in itself or as an academic exercise. Above all, it is a tool of management and care must be taken to determine the "threshold" where the cost of evaluation would be disproportionate to the benefits it can produce.

E. Training

50. Some organizations have already held training courses in evaluation and the reaction has been favourable. But not enough people have been reached. All of those responsible for the planning and execution of activities should be fully aware of the principles and methods of evaluation and how to apply them in their everyday work. Also, those involved in the administrative processes of an organization need this training.

51. The ability to use evaluation techniques should be required of those staff members who plan and execute programmes. The additional skills can be acquired through training.

F. Relationship between the activities of the United Nations system and those of Governments

52. It is clear that many activities of the United Nations organizations are merely a part of the more comprehensive work of national governments. In these instances, governments should be encouraged to evaluate, on their own or in co-operation with international organizations, the benefits and impacts of their programmes as a means of improving both their own programmes and United Nations activities. This can best be done by providing for systematic monitoring and evaluation in the project formulation processes and country agreements.

53. Whether or not a government wishes to evaluate its own programmes, the United Nations organizations have a responsibility to evaluate their own activities. This naturally would limit the scope of such evaluations, but nonetheless, these should yield important information on the status and impact of United Nations activities by examining the quality and quantity of United Nations contributions, their timely delivery, the extent to which accomplishments contributed to objectives and the identification of issues to be resolved.

G. Relationship between field operations and headquarters activities

54. A distinction can be made between evaluations of field operations and headquarters. In the case of the former, which are developed through project documents containing basic data, there is a common framework from which to evaluate. In contrast, headquarters activities often lack such detailed planning documentation. Because of this difference, it should be easier to develop and establish a compatible system for evaluating field project, but initial efforts should not be concentrated solely in this area. Evaluations of headquarters activities may be more difficult, but still can provide essential information to governing bodies and secretariats. Where objectives and related information are insufficiently stated in planning documents, extra efforts should be made to develop and improve planning and design which would thereby improve future evaluations. The fact that United Nations organizations are making concerted efforts to improve their programme budgets and medium-term plans is encouraging.

H. Diverse approaches to evaluation by United Nations organizations

55. It was observed in Part II of this report that evaluation systems are being developed independently by each organization with little co-ordination. This will result in systems which may be different. Such diversity is not in itself necessarily wrong. Indeed, the differences in the mandates, structures and modes of operation of the organizations will have to be reflected in the methodology that each uses for evaluation.

56. However, unless these methodologies are developed in accordance with some compatible guidelines and principles, there is a possibility that evaluation efforts will be ineffective and will not provide the essential information needed by governing bodies and secretariats. Commonly accepted principles and guidelines would yield valuable insights into the relative effectiveness of organizations and would make it possible for organizations to borrow successful techniques from others. A common approach would also facilitate the work of the United Nations Economic and Social Council and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in co-ordinating the work of the agencies.

57. For these reasons, Part IV-D of this report proposes a method for establishing compatible guidelines or principles for use by all organizations in developing their evaluation systems.

I. The choice of activities for evaluation

58. Until now, most organizations have concentrated their efforts in evaluation largely on technical co-operation projects. These are easier to cope with than

major substantive programmes or even administrative activities, because they usually have a project document or equivalent which states objectives and anticipated uses of resources and results.

59. Evaluation built into the plans and procedures of all organizations is a long-term goal. In the present situation, however, the choice of activities to evaluate is important because resources, both intellectual and financial, are limited and it is obviously necessary to concentrate on those activities for which evaluation can be most useful. Among the criteria for choice, the following are suggested:

- (a) Activities which have encountered difficulties;
- (b) Activities which have been carried out for a long time and which may now be of marginal interest in view of changing priorities;
- (c) Activities being considered for substantial expansion;
- (d) Activities whose cost-effectiveness is uncertain;
- (e) Activities which are typical of many other activities, e.g. institution-building projects, and for which evaluation could provide guidance for the other similar activities.

J. Support activities for evaluation

60. The methods for programme budgeting, medium-term planning and design used by organizations have improved markedly in recent years, but much still remains to be done. JIU has contributed to this process and will continue to do so in the future. It is important that planners, when preparing medium-term plans and programme budgets, do so with their use as an element for evaluation clearly in mind.

61. Management information systems of organizations should also be designed to assist in the evaluation process by providing data needed by evaluators. This would be less costly than the ad hoc accumulation of information for each evaluation study. Some organizations, particularly WHO, have already recognized this need and are redesigning their information systems in consequence.

IV. THE USE OF EVALUATION IN THE FUTURE

A. The suggested approach

62. A gradual approach is suggested so as not to require large expenditures and to permit time for the development of more effective principles, guidelines and methodologies. Time is also required in order to better integrate evaluation with planning, programming and information systems.

63. The steps proposed are outlined in the remainder of this part of the report. They include inter-organization consultations to arrive at an agreed glossary of terms including a definition of evaluation, guidelines and principles for internal evaluation.

B. Definition of evaluation

64. At present, there is no commonly-accepted definition of evaluation within the United Nations system. It is subject to different interpretations, and frequently each organization has its own definition; often "analysis", "appraisal", "assessment", or even "inspection" are used to mean the same thing, i.e. "evaluation". There has been a constant struggle within the United Nations system in an effort to form a definition that might describe evaluation for the purposes of each agency. In academic circles, as well, there is no definition that is accepted by all of the experts. At the fourteenth session of the General Conference of UNESCO (1964), as has been mentioned before, it was determined that evaluation should be reserved for those studies that "permit rigorous scientific measurement of the effects of a project or activity". This may be a sound approach, although the term "rigorous scientific measurement" could be misleading because many activities are not fully quantifiable, but are evaluable.

65. The Working Group on United Nations Programme and Budget Machinery referred in its report to evaluation as:

"... the continuous measuring, monitoring and reporting of programmes and activities on a selective basis to determine the degree of effectiveness, efficiency and economy achieved in relation to established goals and objectives. This evaluation process, serving as 'feedback', provides a basis for the next cycle of planning and programming".^{23/}

66. This definition calls for a comparison between approved programmes and achievements to identify gaps and the reasons thereof for the following purposes: timely and effective corrective action to ensure that the objectives of the various components of a programme and of the programmes as a whole are realized; the revision of programmes which are shown to be unrealistic, ineffective or of excessive cost; and providing "feedback" to guide future planning and programming. Thus, evaluation must be a continuous process and an essential component of sound management.

^{23/} Document A/10117, of 17 June 1975, paragraph 67.

67. Another definition which has appeared to gain some acceptance is:

"Evaluation is the analysis of the results against objectives in order to assess the extent to which the latter are being, or have been, realized, as well as to explain any discrepancy between the results and the objectives. Both the development and re-assessment of objectives may also be part of evaluation.

On-going evaluation is a preliminary analysis of the outputs, effects and likely impact of an activity during its implementation. The purpose of on-going evaluation is to provide management and Member Governments (or inter-governmental governing bodies) with information on a continuing basis, to enable them to assess, and if necessary, adjust policies, objectives, institutional arrangements and resources affecting the activity during implementation.

Ex-post evaluation is the analysis of the effects and impact of an activity after its completion. The purpose of ex-post evaluation is to provide management and Member Governments (or inter-governmental governing bodies) with information for future planning of similar activities, as well as to provide material for the evaluation of similar activities and the evaluation of programmes".^{24/}

68. An important aspect of this definition is the effort to measure results against objectives, and probably this alone would suffice for a simple, commonly understood definition. Many evaluation systems are not fully effective because objectives are not clearly and precisely defined.

69. Some organizations have expanded this definition and consider evaluation not only as a comparison between results and objectives, but also as a means towards learning from experience of the past to permit better planning for the future. This is done by assessing not only the achievement of the stated objectives of an activity, but also its adequacy, its efficiency, its acceptance by the parties involved while taking into consideration possible unplanned effects. Evaluation is also seen by one organization (WHO) as a process for directing an activity towards set targets throughout its evolution, while at the same time (i.e. during implementation) assessing its achievements, its quality and, when feasible, its impact.

70. When considering definitions it is also necessary to bear in mind what evaluation is not:

(a) It is not a decision-making process. Decisions are assisted by the results of evaluation.

^{24/} Taken from definition used at the Workshop on Monitoring and Evaluation of Rural Development Projects and Programmes at Holte, Denmark, 6-10 December 1976, and attended by representatives of various multilateral and bilateral aid agencies (including UN, UNDP, WHO, ILO, FAO, AID, SIDA, World Bank, etc.).

(b) It is not an infringement upon national decision-making as to the content of programmes or the priorities that are assigned, though undoubtedly its analyses and conclusions may influence such decision-making (it is an assessment of the management and impact of the United Nations contribution to programmes and operations).

(c) External evaluation is not a substitute for evaluation responsibilities of executive heads (but it can be of assistance in executing this responsibility).

(d) It is not a financial audit report.

71. None of these definitions is perfect, but they do form a nucleus for development of a suitable definition acceptable throughout the United Nations system. JIU proposes to continue to work with organizations to arrive at a technically sound definition of evaluation which is acceptable to United Nations organizations.

72. This definition would be included in a glossary of terms and concepts related to evaluation to be circulated throughout the United Nations system and which hopefully would serve as a useful reference book. Such a glossary should also make a distinction between various categories of evaluation, ranging from the quasi-experimental or scientific types of evaluation to the most empirical. Category I, for example, would include all types of evaluation which would meet the strictest definition and criteria for evaluation. Category II would comprise those with less refined techniques. Category III, much less refined, etc.

C. Organizational responsibilities

73. A distinction should be made between "internal evaluation", carried out under the control of the executive head of an organization, and "external evaluation", carried out by a governing body or other organ independent of the secretariat, such as mandated to the JIU by the General Assembly. Both forms of evaluation may use the same techniques, and data gathered under one may also serve for the other. Effective internal evaluation helps give external evaluation a solid base and vice versa.

74. Some form of independent external evaluation may be required in order to provide the necessary checks and balances to internal evaluation and also as an instrument of the legislative and governing bodies in the exercise of parliamentary control over United Nations expenditures and operations. External evaluation can play a prominent role in making available to the member States an objective review of the achievements of a programme or project in relation to the results, as well as the cost incurred by the United Nations. Furthermore, an independent external evaluation system can be an instrument for reform and improvement in the activities of the United Nations organizations.

75. However, the great bulk of evaluation carried out within the United Nations system will no doubt be internal evaluation which should be part of the management and supervisory functions of each executive head. Internal evaluation results would serve a useful purpose for review bodies external to the secretariats, such as governing bodies, the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, External Auditors and the Joint Inspection Unit.

D. Tentative guidelines or principles for internal evaluation

76. This section represents a first attempt at developing guidelines or principles for internal evaluation under the following headings:

- (a) Purposes and scope of evaluation;
- (b) Characteristics of an evaluation system;
- (c) The main steps in evaluation;
- (d) Creation and operation of an evaluation system;
- (e) Methodology for evaluation.

77. This section contains principles and criteria to guide organizations in their introduction or revision of internal evaluation systems. These would help ensure that evaluation, as carried out by each organization, covers the essential points with a common approach without, however, seeking to impose a uniform system for all organizations. The guidelines might also be considered as a check-list for those preparing internal evaluation systems to help them ensure that all relevant elements have been included in their system.

78. Because of the diverse missions, structures, procedures and information systems of the United Nations organizations, it is not possible to devise a single comprehensive and detailed internal evaluation system that could be used by all organizations. Instead guidelines containing general principles and standards are being developed and will be proposed to organizations. The guidelines presented below represent a first attempt to establish principles. They are not yet suggested for application by organizations. This will have to await detailed consultations with the organizations on the basis of these tentative guidelines and subsequent revised versions. In a next phase, after more practical experience has been obtained, the guidelines may be made more specific by introducing principles to guide evaluation in specific areas of activity.

(a) Purpose and scope of evaluation

79. The purpose of evaluation is the improvement of an organization's work and impact, including an increase in cost effectiveness. To be most effective, evaluation should be built into programme and project design so that points of reference are available for comparison for periods before an activity was started, during its implementation and upon its conclusion. It follows, therefore, that the lack of good planning and project design limit the results that can be expected from evaluation. Furthermore, evaluation should be a tool for the decision-maker for weighing alternative methods or approaches in order to maximize the effectiveness of activities.

80. The scope of evaluations will vary, but there are some major elements and questions that should be included for them to achieve their purpose of improving an organization's work and impact. The following list is not meant to be

all-inclusive or mandatory, but would provide information most likely to be needed by governing bodies and secretariats.

(a) Evaluation should examine the original concept of an activity so that governing bodies can determine whether it is necessary to change the objectives.

- (i) Are the objectives sufficiently explicit?
- (ii) Do the objectives of the activity contribute to the solution of priority problems?
- (iii) Are the objectives still relevant?

(b) Evaluation should be a tool of management in determining the activity's effectiveness and impact in achieving the stated objectives.

- (i) Are there specified indicators against which the attainment of objectives can be measured and impact determined?
- (ii) Has the degree of implementation of objectives produced the expected impact? (i.e. whether and to what extent the organization's activities are effective in contribution to development (quantitative and/or qualitative) in developing countries).

(c) Evaluation should provide information on the impact of the United Nations system's activities which should contribute to government objectives. (These evaluations may be done in conjunction with the government or they may be restricted to activities as discussed in paragraphs 52 and 53).

- (i) Did the government use or does it plan to use the contribution of the United Nations system?
- (ii) Was the government satisfied with what it received?
- (iii) What is the extent of acceptance of the activity and co-operation by the governments concerned?
- (iv) Would another approach to the problem - or other objectives - produce more useful results for governments at an equivalent or lesser cost?

(d) Evaluation could assess the cost-effectiveness of an activity.

- (i) Is the cost of attaining the objectives generally reasonable in terms of the importance of the objectives and the share of the organization's budget being used?
- (ii) Are there other ways of attaining the objectives that are less costly and/or more effective?

(e) Evaluation should provide information on an organization's efficiency.

- (i) Does the activity duplicate or overlap work done elsewhere or could it more efficiently be carried out by another organization?
- (ii) Are other United Nations organizations concerned and have they been consulted or associated with the activity?
- (iii) Are there administrative problems in providing and maximizing the use of resources (money, staff and material)?

(f) Evaluation should signal the need for corrective actions for on-going activities and suggest the form they might take.

- (i) Should the objectives and/or targets be restated and is there a need for introducing more precise achievement indicators?
- (ii) Should implementation be changed?
- (iii) Should resource inputs be increased, decreased or shifted?

(g) Evaluation should serve as a basis for planning, programming and executing future activities.

- (i) What lessons can be learned from the evaluation of activities which may be transferable to other activities?
- (ii) How can these lessons be made available at the time of planning other activities?

(b) Characteristics of an evaluation process

81. Evaluation should be looked upon as a constructive process which is aimed towards improving the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations and programmes. Evaluation should be a continuous, participatory process; all levels in an organization should be involved. It is important that evaluation should not be undertaken in a rigid and mechanistic way. Flexibility should be the watchword. It must be relevant and not so theoretical that it will not be understood, and therefore not accepted, or ignored by organizations and member States. It must take advantage of useful systems and techniques. Both the form of an evaluation and the end results should provide relevant information and stimulate interest and action.

82. Any effective evaluation system should have these general characteristics:

- (a) Although evaluation can take various forms, there must be advance planning to determine the purpose, scope and resources required in order to justify the effort and to ensure that the results will be of use to recipients.

(b) Internal evaluation should be the principal responsibility of the organization concerned.

(c) It should be participatory.

(d) It should be constructive in approach.

(e) Operational units within the organizations should be primarily responsible for the process of evaluation, with a central unit giving guidance and reviewing the effects of the system within the organization, as well as conducting some ad hoc evaluations.

(f) A rigid framework should not be placed around evaluation. The system should be reasonably flexible but should also be sufficiently systematic so that an outside review or check of the techniques and results could be made.

(g) It should have an integrated information system to support it.

(h) It should be action oriented to facilitate improvements and implementations of recommended changes.

(i) It should contain a follow-up mechanism to determine and periodically report on what actions have been taken to implement evaluation recommendations.

(c) The main steps in evaluation

83. For maximum effectiveness, an evaluation system should consist of a number of systematic steps. Also, for certain kinds of on-going evaluations, it should be sufficient to develop a standard methodology which could be used in successive evaluations. In contrast, non-recurring in-depth evaluations would require the development of individual methodologies. The major steps for conducting evaluation are as follows:

(a) Determine the purpose, scope and potential users of evaluation;

(b) Identify the activity's objectives and progress indicators;

(c) Collect all pertinent data and information on the activity's background, resource inputs, accomplishments, problems, etc.

(d) Analyze data and information in relation to activity objectives and results achieved. This analysis should include, if feasible, a determination of cost effectiveness of the on-going activity as well as alternatives.

(e) Consider uncontrollable external factors which may affect results.

(f) Prepare a report containing findings, conclusions and recommendations. This should be an action document with specific recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the activity for future planning and programming.

84. Each of the above steps requires a systematic methodology, but this will vary according to the nature of the activity and the internal structure, procedures and information system of each organization. Nevertheless, a knowledge of the methodology used by other organizations would be helpful to all. Therefore, the JIU will arrange an exchange of information on evaluation procedures among organizations. This report is the first example of such an exchange.

85. A more detailed description of steps in evaluation based upon a WHO document is in Annex XIV.

(d) The creation and operation of an evaluation system

86. Below are listed the principles which should be considered when creating or operating an internal evaluation system. Certain of the principles may not be applicable to all systems but their inclusion or not in the system should be decided objectively and on the basis of the practical possibilities of each organization.

87. It may well be that some of the principles could not be applied initially because of lack of resources or because of other practical difficulties. However, systems should be constructed in such a way that it would be possible to add these principles at a later date when their need and feasibility are justified.

88. As for the preceding parts, the principles presented below are tentative and subject to review and revision in consultation with the organizations.

Contribution of evaluation to the decision-making process

- (a) There should be top-level direction and support for evaluation.
- (b) There should be a formal connexion between evaluation and planning programme budgeting and programme execution.
- (c) Evaluation should provide "feedback" for programme planning.
- (d) There should be a direct relationship between the evaluation systems and other management processes.
- (e) Evaluation should signal the need for corrective actions and suggest the nature of such actions.
- (f) Results of evaluation should be taken into consideration by decision-makers within the secretariat and by governing organs as appropriate.

Programming and budgeting should provide adequate baselines for evaluation

- (a) The programming system (medium-term plans, programme budgets, project documents, internal work plans), should provide sufficiently explicit objectives and targets, making use of both quantitative and qualitative indicators as benchmarks for evaluation.

(b) The programming system should provide sufficiently explicit details on inputs to evaluate their delivery both quantitatively and qualitatively.

(c) The budgeting system should provide sufficient information on actual costs for a cost-effectiveness determination.

Linked to Management Information System

(a) Information systems should provide data of the kind and in the form required by the evaluation system.

(b) The evaluation system should feed back data into the information system.

(c) Results of evaluations should be provided on time to those who need them.

Evaluation methodology is adequate and adjusted to the requirements of diverse activities

(a) Methodology should be sufficiently developed and explicit to ensure a uniform and technically sound approach to evaluation.

(b) Methodology should be sufficiently varied to permit evaluation under the broad headings of technical co-operation, programmes and management.

(c) Methodology should be sufficiently flexible to take account of different characteristics of activities being evaluated.

(d) Methodology should include criteria for selecting and defining indicators and their use in evaluation.

(e) Methodology should include a grading and weighting mechanism or some similar technique to arrive at an overall summary evaluation which can compare similar activities.

Organizational arrangements for evaluation

(a) There should be a specific unit appropriately staffed and responsible for determining methodologies in accordance with guidelines; training staff in the use of the methodologies and ensuring that the methodologies are applied in evaluation and assisting in preparing and reviewing evaluation reports. Follow-up on recommendations resulting from evaluations may or may not be assigned to that unit.

(b) There should be organizational links between: programming, budget formulation and evaluation; information system and evaluation; execution and evaluation; decision-making and evaluation.

(e) Methodology for evaluation

89. Like evaluation, "methodology" is a word that is frequently used but not always commonly understood. Definitions can be several. Probably the most practical definition is that "methodology" is the means or methods by which evaluations are undertaken, i.e. procedures to be followed in evaluating a programme or project. Modern methodology suggests the full use of statistics, data processing systems, technical information, questionnaires, services of experts, etc.

90. Methods must be adapted to the purpose of each evaluation. There is no single method that will fulfil all purposes and types of evaluations, although there should be a systematic approach to evaluation and some applied standards adapted to the programme or project being evaluated. It should be recognized that such an approach or use of methodology does not imply a rigid approach and requires all organizations or programmes to follow identical processes. While it is possible to apply a common methodology to similar types of projects, and possibly programmes, it is not possible to conceive a single comprehensive methodology for application throughout the various United Nations agencies because of the different nature of their projects and the varying range of agencies' fields of work. However, certain common principles may be feasible. Regardless of which methodology is used, it is essential that the evaluation be conducted systematically so that it may be validated and withstand critical review.

E. The role of the Joint Inspection Unit in evaluation

91. It is clear that evaluation must be carried out primarily within each organization. Giving the responsibility to a central unit, external to the secretariats for such continuous evaluation in the various organizations of the United Nations system is not a substitute; indeed even if it were practicable, it would be far too expensive. Therefore, the JIU, with its very small staff, must undertake selective activities, so as to best attain the evaluation objectives of governing bodies and secretariats.

92. The first task for the JIU in evaluation must be to encourage the establishment of effective internal evaluation procedures within each organization. Although these should not be required to adopt rigidly the same organizational form, there should be some general standards applied for each organization. This is an advisory and overseeing task for the JIU. The JIU should also undertake regular reviews of the internal evaluation systems of each of the agencies and offer advice and assistance in improving these processes. It should selectively review the results of some of the internal evaluations and offer corrective advice where appropriate. The JIU could also prepare reports, perhaps on a biennial basis, on the status of evaluation procedures in each United Nations agency.

93. The JIU should, as required by its new statute, undertake ad hoc external evaluations sometimes working with the agencies involved. Generally, however, it should concentrate its ad hoc evaluation efforts on system-wide problems and issues rather than single agency issues. The latter is primarily the task of the agency itself.

F. The potential benefits of evaluation in the United Nations system

94. We have seen from the description of the historical development of evaluation in the United Nations that for many years attempts have been made to evaluate the work of some of the organizations. We have also seen that for the most part these attempts have been technically faulty and that the selection of activities to be evaluated has been somewhat haphazard. The improvement of the technical quality of evaluation will take time and effort and recommendations are made in Part V of this report. But in parallel with the improvement of methods, it is important to keep in mind the objectives of evaluation not so much to justify continued effort, but rather to guide and stimulate future action.

95. In estimating what benefits more systematic evaluation can bring to the United Nations system, one must first consider the present situation which appears to be characterized by problems faced by inter-governmental bodies and secretariats of how to best allocate limited resources among competing programmes and the direction approved programmes should take in the future. Decision-makers have been faced with a lack of sufficient knowledge of what has been accomplished in the past and in particular whether the rapidly increasing resources are being used most effectively to obtain the maximum impact in line with objectives. This situation has led governing bodies and those entrusted with the development of plans to work more on the basis of incomplete information than on a systematic assessment of quality and impact of projects and programmes. It is clear that evaluation should provide information for governing bodies and secretariats so that priorities can be determined and resources can be allocated rationally on the basis of systematic reviews and analyses.

96. Evaluation benefits should permeate throughout the organizations and, to the extent that it is a participatory process, this should be possible. Secretariats are confronted with the need to carry out mandates and to achieve objectives most effectively and with greatest impact. Very often organizations are not certain of their results because there has not been a systematic evaluation of their accomplishments in relation to their mandates.

97. With the above two primary users of evaluation in mind (governing bodies and secretariats), it is possible to identify specific long-range benefits that might be provided by evaluation processes. These benefits will not accrue quickly - much work and some investment will be needed before the existing evaluation mechanisms can be developed or the methodologies of existing processes sufficiently improved to provide desired results. These principal benefits can be summarized as follows:

(a) Priorities. For activities which have been carried out for a long time and which may have lost their purpose or priority but which are continued incrementally by force of habit, evaluation would help determine whether such activities should be curtailed or eliminated to make room, often without budgetary increases, for new or higher priorities identified by legislative bodies.

(b) Cost effectiveness. Although legislative bodies give serious consideration to the potential benefits and priorities of new activities, they often do not include an examination of alternative ways of getting the work done. Thus, there is little assurance that the methods adopted are the least costly or

whether other alternative methods, using less resources, could not produce the same or even better results. Evaluation could help provide this information.

(c) Planning. With the gradual introduction of medium-term plans and programme budgets, the planning process in the United Nations system has assumed greater significance. Since it is a complex process, governing and legislative bodies find it increasingly difficult to question the basic concepts and procedures of on-going activities. In this connexion, evaluation could play a useful role by pointing out the successes and failures of similar activities undertaken in the past and thus render the planning process more realistic.

(d) Managing. Day-to-day management is difficult under the best of circumstances. In the United Nations system, with its vast array of programmes and projects, the complexity of this task is multiplied. Secretariats need to know on a current basis how they are using their very limited resources and when to make changes. This involves determining their impacts and results. Related to this is the secretariats' need for this kind of information when justifying and explaining to governing bodies their accomplishments and their need for continuing or additional resources. Internal evaluation would be useful in providing this information on a timely basis.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations presented below were considered in detail by the Inspectors of the JIU and are endorsed by them.

A. Conclusions

1. Despite the impressive number of reports, resolutions and discussions devoted to evaluation since at least the late 1940s, significant progress has not been made towards systematic evaluation and what progress there has been has evolved slowly. Part of this can be attributed to the fact that interest in evaluation appears to rise and fall; at the moment it is encouraging to note that it is at one of its high points. However, evaluation as an art and a science is still rudimentary in the United Nations system. Therefore, caution must be urged so that current expectations for rapid results from evaluation should not be too high (paragraphs 7-32 and 43-44).
2. With a few exceptions, there is very little evaluation being done by United Nations organizations that would meet any acceptable definition or agreed common principles or guidelines. Nevertheless, most organizations express the need for more and better evaluation, but most appear to be groping for methods to accomplish this, some in a more systematic way than others. Organizational arrangements differ widely and there is little or no co-ordination between individual organizations (paragraphs 33-41). Commonly accepted principles and guidelines would yield valuable insights into the relative effectiveness of organizations and would make it possible for organizations to borrow successful techniques from others (paragraphs 76-90).
3. An evaluation system, although needed in any organization, will have to be tuned to the needs, size and resources of each particular organization (paragraph 38).
4. A gradual approach seems preferable for the introduction of evaluation. Resources should be made available from existing related activities, such as the programme planning, information and reporting systems; these resources should be built into an integrated system embracing evaluation (paragraphs 47-49 and 62).
5. Effective evaluation also requires continuing top-level support (paragraph 45).
6. Until now, evaluation in most organizations has concentrated on technical co-operation projects. This is understandable because evaluation of specific, somewhat narrowly-oriented projects is easier than wide-ranging programmes or headquarters activities. Some organizations have recognized the need to extend evaluation to major substantive programmes, but none as yet appears to be applying evaluation techniques to management and administrative activities (paragraphs 58-59).
7. Despite the increasing interest in evaluation, there is no accepted definition of the term of evaluation which could be used throughout the United Nations system;

nor is there any common understanding of the purposes of evaluation. At the moment, "evaluation" is used to describe various activities which would not meet basic criteria for evaluation (paragraphs 39-41).

8. Various definitions of evaluation (both internal and external) are analyzed in the report. An important aspect of evaluation, at least in the initial phase, is the comparison of results against objectives. Many evaluations are not fully effective because activities being evaluated do not have clearly-defined objectives, and little consideration has been given to progress indicators (paragraphs 64-72).

9. Evaluation of technical co-operation activities within the United Nations system should always cover the contributions of United Nations organizations to governmental programmes. Governments should be encouraged to evaluate on their own, or in co-operation with United Nations organizations, the benefits and impacts of their programmes (paragraphs 52-53).

10. Programme budgeting and medium-term planning in the United Nations system are now only beginning to take a form required for evaluation - a clear statement of objectives and the anticipated resource inputs and results for each objective (paragraphs 60 and 88).

11. Part of the lack of progress in this field might be explained by the inadequacy of information and reporting systems which would facilitate objective and systematic comparisons, as well as well-defined techniques and procedures for evaluations (paragraphs 48 and 61). In addition, there is a lack of staff experienced and qualified in evaluation in the United Nations system (paragraphs 50-51).

12. The report makes a distinction between internal and external evaluation (paragraphs 73-75) and sets forth tentative guidelines or principles for internal evaluation (paragraphs 76-90). Evaluation should be looked upon as a constructive concept aimed at improving the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations and programmes. It should be a continuous participatory process, generating feedback information, in which all units are involved (paragraphs 81 and 82).

13. The great bulk of evaluation carried out within the United Nations system will be internal evaluation which should be part of the management and supervisory functions for each executive head (paragraphs 73-75).

14. Any evaluation system which is developed must not be too rigid in its design and requirements. It must be flexible and based upon pragmatic considerations (paragraphs 81-82).

15. Evaluation should be an integral and contributory part of the decision-making process. It should signal the need for corrective action and suggest the nature of such actions. It should provide useful information for planning and programming of future activities (paragraphs 79-80 and 88).

16. Potential benefits from evaluations accrue to governing bodies and secretariats by providing a more rational basis for decision-making and managing resources (paragraphs 94-97).

17. There is no single comprehensive methodology which will fulfil all purposes and types of evaluations, although there should be a systematic approach to evaluation and some applied standards adapted to the programme or project being evaluated (paragraphs 89-90).

B. Recommendations

18. Following a gradual approach, the United Nations organizations and the JIU should attempt to do the following:

(a) Exchange information and techniques in the field of evaluation, so that each agency can learn what others are doing and can profit by their experiences (paragraph 84);

(b) Develop a glossary of terms, including an agreed definition of evaluation which could be used throughout the United Nations system and establish principles for evaluation. This probably should not be a narrow, restricted definition. In every case, it should incorporate the concepts of systematic, objective comparison of results against specific objectives (paragraph 72).

(c) Develop categories of evaluation, with illustrations for each. For example, Category I would include all types of evaluation which would meet the strictest definition and criteria for evaluation. Category II would comprise those with less refined techniques. Category III, much less refined, etc. (paragraph 72);

(d) Establish effective internal evaluation systems within each organization (paragraph 92);

(e) Establish a training programme to provide staff concerned with programme planning and execution in the United Nations organizations with the skills needed for evaluation (paragraphs 50-51);

(f) Develop broad guidelines for internal evaluation systems which can be used by each United Nations agency (paragraphs 76-90).

19. The JIU should:

(a) Conduct periodic reviews of evaluation systems' effectiveness and of the results of selective individual evaluations and make recommendations as to what corrections or modifications are required (paragraph 92);

(b) Prepare, on the basis of a continuous flow of information from all agencies, a biennial report on the status of evaluation systems in each United Nations agency (paragraph 92);

(c) Develop a guide for the creation and operation of an internal evaluation system for use by organizations which are introducing or revising their evaluation practices (paragraphs 86-88 and 92).

(d) Undertake ad hoc evaluation concentrating especially on system-wide problems or issues (paragraph 93).

20. All United Nations organizations should:

(a) Give priority to the development of their evaluation systems;

(b) Keep the JIU informed on a continuing basis regarding the development of effective internal evaluation systems and on any plans for future changes of their systems;

(c) Seek the advice of the JIU in the development of their systems.

Annex I

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS

Current Practices

1. In recent years, since 1975, the United Nations has begun a process aimed at introducing evaluation on a gradual basis in the Secretariat. This process has now culminated in the preparation of four evaluation reports in response to a decision of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) to consider in depth at its seventeenth session in May 1977 four programmes - environment, human settlements, public information, transport. At this writing the four evaluation reports on these programmes were not yet available but it appears likely that these first reports will not fully meet the standards for evaluation. However, their preparation has no doubt provided the Secretariat with valuable experience for the introduction of an internal evaluation system.
2. The recent efforts in evaluation may be considered to have begun with the publication in June 1975 of the report of the Working Group on United Nations Programme and Budget Machinery (A/10117). This report outlined the problems of evaluation and set the stage for further work. In November of 1975, the Secretary-General issued a report on programme evaluation (A/10035/Add.1). This report described procedures and analytical techniques for evaluation and gave some examples of what were then considered to be evaluation activities and their results. However, it was clear that none of the activities described represented more than assessments of past work, based more on subjective judgements than on evaluation techniques. This report was discussed in the Advisory Committee for Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Fifth Committee and its approach endorsed.
3. The next step in the process came with the publication of the Medium Term Plan for 1976-1979 which in Chapter III of Part One outlined a proposed method for rating programmes to determine priorities in the allocation of budgetary growth, without, however, making provision for programme evaluation. This method was discussed by CPC, at its fifteenth session, which felt that it would help in planning future growth (E/5632, paragraph 21).
4. The Medium Term Plan for 1978-1981 in Volume II presented a "programme assessment exercise", based on the general approach of the method outlined in the previous plan. During its consideration of this document, CPC decided to examine in depth at its seventeenth session in 1977 four programmes, as mentioned above (paragraph 1) and expressed the hope that internal and external evaluation could be performed on these programmes (A/31/38, paragraph 44). As a result, the four evaluation reports on these programmes are being prepared by the United Nations Secretariat for the attention of CPC.
5. The most recent step in the process came with the adoption by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session of a resolution (A/RES/31/93), proposed by the Fifth Committee dealing with the Medium Term Plan and which reconfirmed CPC's specific responsibility for in-depth reviews of major programmes. This will no doubt require the continued use of evaluation techniques already

initiated by CPC. This same resolution also recalled the need which has been recognized for many years to improve and strengthen the evaluation process as a part of planning, programming and budgeting.

6. Concurrently with the process described above, many inter-governmental bodies have continued their periodic reviews of progress in carrying out programmes and drew conclusions from these reviews. In the absence of an internal evaluation system, the reviews by inter-governmental and specialized bodies could not benefit from data and techniques which evaluation could provide. However, participants were able to bring their specialized knowledge to bear on problems and as a result, many programmes have been reoriented. When the Secretariat is in a position to provide internal evaluation reports to those bodies, their work will be facilitated and their conclusions might well have a more scientific basis.

Summary Assessment

7. Thanks mainly to the initiative of CPC, the Secretariat is just beginning on an experimental basis to introduce evaluation for selected major programmes. Since the first internal evaluation reports are not yet available, it is too soon to judge whether the techniques used and the results obtained are adequate. But it is encouraging that a start has been made and it is hoped that the United Nations will, using the experience it is acquiring, join with other organizations in developing and applying common guidelines for evaluation and in increasing its efforts in this field.

Annex II

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)

Current Practices

1. UNIDO has been concerned with evaluation almost from its very start. At the First General International Conference of UNIDO in 1971, it was resolved that the evaluation should be considered as an integral part of the future strategy of UNIDO in all its activities. In 1972, the evaluation missions of UNIDO set out to describe its main functions in the following way: (i) the evaluation of all completed and on-going UNIDO projects in a selected country; (ii) identification of special factors affecting their formulation and implementation; and (iii) recommendations about the on-going and new projects including in the country programmes of 1972-1976.

2. Originally, evaluation was viewed primarily as an exercise to assess progress in an activity. The main objectives of evaluation were to identify problems, find solutions and improve performance. More specifically stated, evaluation was viewed as a mechanism to serve a number of purposes, such as measuring the impact of a project, providing a basis for resource allocation, a means for involving host country in vital areas of development, building up experience, so on and so forth. Thus, in UNIDO's understanding, evaluation was a broad, all-inclusive and somewhat ambiguous term. However, from the start, the importance of evaluation as an indispensable means to achieve desired results was recognized by senior management.

3. Since 1971, about 15 country studies and a number of programme, branch or sector studies have been submitted to the Industrial Development Board (IDB) - UNIDO's main policy-making body. In recent years, IDB has expressed increasing interest in the subject of evaluation with the result that a Permanent Committee has been established and among its several functions is to provide guidance to the evaluation activities of UNIDO with a long-range perspective. There were some reservations about evaluation which were reflected in the debates of the IDB and its Permanent Committee. These included: evaluation infringes on the sovereignty of national governments; it diminishes the authority of the Executive Director; it directs resources into less productive channels; and it duplicates evaluation work already done in the field. Notwithstanding the fact that no consensus on the concepts, criteria and methodology of evaluation existed at the time, in 1974 the Executive Director established a Planning, Programming and Evaluation Section (PPE) to intensify the work on evaluation.

4. In 1975, UNIDO sponsored an Expert Group Meeting on Approaches, Procedures and Methodology of Evaluation of UNIDO's Activities. In the re-organization of UNIDO, which followed shortly thereafter, an Evaluation Unit was re-established in the Programme Development and Evaluation Section (PDES) which is part of the Office of the Executive Director. After reviewing UNIDO's own experience and the recommendations of the Evaluation Expert Group, which included representatives from UNDP, other United Nations executing agencies and bi-lateral development organizations, the Executive Director assigned the following functions to this Unit: (i) designing a comprehensive evaluation system; (ii) assisting in the

testing and installation of the major components of the system; (iii) monitoring system components for secretariat compliance and improvement; and (iv) conducting specific evaluations. In June 1976, the Director of the Division of Policy Co-ordination defined the overall objectives of evaluation as rationalizing the basis for necessary improvements of: UNIDO's policies and procedures; substantive and functional concepts; modalities of technical cooperation; and organization and management - all within the framework of the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action and other declarations of policy-making organs. At the same time, it was determined that the primary purpose of evaluation is to serve as a management tool for UNIDO to increase the effectiveness of its assistance to the member countries. An Advisory Committee on Evaluation was also established to recommend evaluation priorities and subjects and serve as a mechanism for communication and co-ordination of information and experience on evaluation methodologies, developments and results. While PDES provides UNIDO leadership, evaluation is meant to be a day-to-day management tool at all levels of the secretariat.

5. It has been pointed out that, by the end of 1977, systematic evaluation will be substantially institutionalized in UNIDO. The focal point of attention in UNIDO's evaluation exercises will be the substantive aspects of development problems in selected areas. It is also expected that in the future it will be possible to develop a close relationship between selected programmes evaluations, many of the global and sector-oriented studies carried out by the International Centre for Industrial Studies (ICIS), and evaluations of large-scale projects carried out by the Industrial Operations Division (IOD).

6. UNIDO now undertakes three types of evaluation:

(a) Project Evaluation: Field projects are monitored and evaluated in accordance with the system designed by UNDP and in collaboration with the resident representatives and host governments. A recently revised and strengthened system of project formulation and appraisal, which includes a heavy emphasis on project design and built-in evaluation, has been installed at the headquarters. Though UNIDO relies largely on the evaluation system required by UNDP and conducted by field staff, in selected cases special and comprehensive evaluation analysis is intended to be undertaken by using headquarters staff and, if required, outside experts.

(b) Programme Evaluation: Over the years, a number of programme evaluations, involving the appraisal of a group of projects, have been carried out. The Executive Director has assigned top priority in the 1976-1977 work programme to this type of evaluation, especially those jointly undertaken by UNDP and other United Nations agencies.

(c) Process Evaluation: A joint UNDP/UNIDO evaluation of the Industrial Development Field Advisers is in progress. Others will be undertaken as required.

7. The expenses of the Central Evaluation Unit have been borne from UNIDO's regular budget. The only evaluation activity financed from outside the regular budget so far is the industrial estates review now nearing completion which is supported by Sweden. In the current joint evaluation of the textile industries programme, UNDP is sharing the cost with UNIDO for the field missions involved.

Summary Assessment

8. Most of UNIDO's country evaluations were done jointly with the recipient governments and the reports were submitted to the respective governments in addition to the IDB. In the past, some IDB members have expressed dissatisfaction with the content and quality of the reports and several secretariat staff have been disappointed with the lack of impact of these reports. However, the first joint UNDP/UNIDO evaluation exercise, involving the industrial strategies, policies and programmes, was favourably received by the IDB as were the Executive Director's priorities, plans and work programme for the future.

9. UNIDO has not designed the ideal evaluation system but the desire and enthusiasm to improve and rationalize the evaluation in UNIDO is present and is stimulated by the leadership of qualified personnel in its evaluation unit. It hopes to have an effective system installed by the end of this year.

Annex III

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)

Current Practices

1. Continuous evaluation of programme performance is seen by UNDP as a fundamental principle of good management and an essential tool for corrective action. In prior years, UNDP evaluation activities were generally, though not exclusively, focused on the impact or management aspects of technical co-operation, with the aim of obtaining lessons from experience and, on the basis of those lessons, introducing improvements in project operation and management. This served to clarify the system's understanding of the respective and complementary roles of governments, executing agencies and UNDP in country programming and the project cycle and in improving project effectiveness.

2. In 1975, UNDP initiated a major shift in the emphasis of its evaluation activities from an almost exclusive concern with (a) inputs or process aspects to outputs or achievements and (b) evaluation of projects individually to evaluation of projects in groups in selected areas, i.e. programme evaluation.

3. Evaluation proper, in the strict sense of the term, as distinct from appraisal on the one hand and monitoring on the other, is carried out in UNDP at two levels of aggregation, although obviously they are very much interrelated.

(a) Evaluation of Projects individually: This type of evaluation is undertaken in practice for projects receiving relatively large-scale assistance although in principle it is expected to be carried out for all projects regardless of their size. This is distinct from tripartite monitoring which is the review of the progress in the light of parameters established in the project document. It goes beyond monitoring and focuses de novo on a project's background, justification, design and accomplishments. This type of project evaluation is undertaken by individuals, including outside technical consultants, not directly associated with the formulation and implementation of the projects, at a convenient mid-point of a project or towards its conclusion. Provision for evaluation is usually agreed upon during project formulation and scheduled in the project document. It is undertaken by a tripartite team (Government, Agency and UNDP). Frequently, it leads to important adjustments in design calculated to enhance effectiveness. The findings of individual project evaluations are also used in programme evaluation.

(b) Evaluation of groups of projects in selected areas: This is generally called "programme evaluation" and has recently been introduced as a regular and continuous function within UNDP. The general purpose is to assess the contribution that UNDP-funded projects make to progress in selected areas such as development planning, rural development, educational research, etc. It thus attempts to evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and relevance of UNDP-supported activities along some well defined lines and to identify the problem areas that tend to recur. As a matter of principle, "programme evaluation" studies are undertaken either jointly or in close collaboration with the executing agencies, and pass through several stages: desk review, field visits to selected projects in the sample and a synthesis of main findings and conclusions in a general report. Through

programme evaluation, UNDP is attempting to play a critical role within the United Nations system by encouraging executing agencies to assess, as critically as possible, the value and relevance of technical assistance as a concept and as an instrument of development beyond the immediate confines of projects individually.

4. As distinct from "evaluation proper", UNDP has also been engaged in a number of other activities and studies that are closely related to evaluation. The purpose of these activities is also to improve the design and execution of projects and programmes, the main examples of which are: Tripartite periodic monitoring of implementation of individual projects; Appraisal of projects at design stage prior to their approval; terminal assessment of project achievements by the management of project itself and then separately by the resident representative; and Periodic review of country programmes, etc. Furthermore, the Governing Council is presently considering how it can discharge its responsibility for examining the relevance and effectiveness of UNDP-assisted activities in the field. The results of evaluations by individual projects are circulated only among the governments and agencies concerned, and cannot be made public without the government's consent; however, they form the raw material for the preparation of documents which are made available to the Governing Council. These include:

- the annual report of the Administrator on the operation activities of the Programme;
- the consolidated note by the Administrator on country programmes submitted to the Council at each session for its approval;
- case studies of individual projects, providing in-depth analysis of specific projects' experiences (but omitting information on the identity of country or countries assisted, unless agreement of the government(s) concerned is available to do otherwise).

5. Although the experience gained through such exercise and studies has been used as a management tool by UNDP through a number of ways, work has also recently been initiated to formulate an explicit feedback system and to establish an institutional memory.

Summary Assessment

6. Evaluation, and especially individual project evaluation, as it is seen by UNDP, is just one particular phase of the project cycle. It is a specific exercise which takes place once and for all at a particular moment of the cycle (either at mid-project or towards the end). It is perhaps ambitious to call this activity, which is more akin to an external monitoring or reporting exercise, true evaluation. Efforts in programme evaluation are encouraging, but they are as yet far from being systematic. However, it must be remembered that UNDP has the merit of having devised a common framework (though not yet common guidelines or a methodology) for the evaluation of United Nations field activities.

be slowly developing, though it is far from being fully operational. This is perhaps the originality of the FAO approach - to proceed on a trial-and-error basis and to develop formal mechanisms once sufficient experience has been gained. FAO feels that evaluation for its own sake or in accordance with theoretical models must be avoided. What is needed is a practical and effective feedback into the programming at all stages. It is hard to say, at this early stage, if this pragmatic approach will be more productive - operationally and economically - than the more formalistic approach followed by some other agencies. But FAO should be encouraged to proceed with its pragmatic approach which should be closely observed by other organizations, so that they may adopt those features of the FAO approach which are successful to their own needs.

Annex V

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)

Current Practices

1. IAEA follows the normal evaluation procedures established by UNDP and other funding organizations for projects financed from these sources. This includes periodic tripartite evaluation exercises and the evaluation contained in the final reports of such projects. The effectiveness of the fellowship programme is evaluated on a routine basis by means of a questionnaire sent to the fellows three months after completion of their training.

2. Evaluation is carried out on a continuous, though informal basis, within the Department of Technical Assistance; a general programme evaluation takes place during the discussions in the Board of Governors and its Technical Assistance Committee, as well as during the Annual General Conference of IAEA. Elements of evaluation are included in the following annual publications: the Agency's Annual Report and the Director-General's Report on Technical Assistance. In addition, periodic reviews of several aspects of technical cooperation activities have been made by the Agency's Office of Internal Audit and Management Services. Recently, at the Director-General's request, a review of various problems related to the delivery of experts' services was made by an Ad Hoc Study Group.

Summary Assessment

3. Due to its highly specialized nature and relatively limited volume of activities, IAEA has not felt the need to establish a formal legislative authority and elaborate organizational structures for evaluation. Nevertheless, the Technical Assistance Department acts as a structure for evaluation and carries out this function as a continuing process, upon which, from year to year, its future programmes are based. This is probably sufficient for an organization of the size of IAEA. However, like other small organizations, IAEA should follow closely the development of more refined evaluation techniques in the other organizations of the United Nations system and in due course adapt them to its own needs.

Annex VI

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO)

Current Practices

1. There is no explicit legislative mandate on evaluation either from the ICAO Council or Assembly. Evaluation is considered to be implicit in the management of a project by the Technical Assistance Bureau of the organization, as well as in the requirement for most projects that facilities and training must meet the international ICAO standards and recommended practices.
2. Field projects are explicitly subject to the normal tripartite reviews. In a few cases, the organization has evaluated certain programmes. The African Manpower and Training Requirement Survey project was one of them. The agency regularly inspects the UNDP/ICAO financial regional training institutes and expects to start a project in May 1977 to evaluate civil aviation training methodology. A field evaluation programme to assess the work of the ICAO regional experts has been carried out over the past two years.
3. Most of what is considered to be evaluation is done by routine management, including periodic visits by headquarters officials to the field, special field missions, half-yearly progress reports from project managers, questionnaire techniques and routine correspondence.

Summary Assessment

4. Due to the highly specialized nature and limited scale of ICAO activities, coupled with their inherent self-checking features, dictated by safety, the subject of evaluation has not been a priority area of endeavour, except in the managerial sense, as stated above. There is little need for elaborate systems, but ICAO should, like other small organizations, introduce those evaluation techniques which are considered appropriate, as these are developed in other parts of the United Nations system.

Annex VII

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE (ILO)

Current Practices

1. In its "Draft Long-Term Plan for 1974-1979" 1/, prepared in 1972, ILO stated that the "clear purpose of evaluation should be the adjustment and improvement of ILO programme objectives and methods of action ... The first problem is to develop criteria and methods of evaluation". In 1975, referring more specifically to the evaluation of technical cooperation projects 2/, ILO said that "the focus of evaluation is to improve project design, operations and results - to accomplish meaningful change - by reducing the risk inherent in programme or project decisions". In 1976, ILO, in explaining why improved systems and methods of evaluation seemed necessary 3/, added another element to the purpose of evaluation: "it is to provide inputs for the planning and periodic evaluation of entire ILO programmes, and then to test the validity of strategies, policies and approaches being followed in ILO programmes".
2. Some ten years ago, ILO, as well as other agencies in the United Nations system, came to recognize the need for evaluation. This recognition was reflected in the ILO's participation to the work of the Inter-Agency Study Group on Evaluation, established in 1966 by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and in a resolution of the International Labour Conference, in 1967, which called for the introduction of a more systematic approach to project evaluation. The UNDP guidelines for evaluation have been followed to some extent by the ILO which, however, thinks that their "unstructured nature ... makes a systematic approach to evaluation difficult" 4/.
3. In 1975, a review was conducted in ILO on the "state of the art" of evaluation in the Office. ILO considered that in the past years, it had "evaluated" in a general way and that its "evaluation" activities - without questioning their intrinsic value - did not represent an objective and informative evaluation exercise. The report 5/, submitted in August 1975 to the Management Activities Board (MAB), contained some preliminary proposals concerning the evaluation of technical cooperation projects. The MAB endorsed the need for proper project evaluation and, before recommending the adoption of any particular method or system of project evaluation, it requested (and the Director-General decided) 6/ that certain preliminary surveys and activities be undertaken (survey of past experience in ILO and other international organizations, evaluation methodology seminar for some officials, development of objectively verifiable indicators in one or more ILO technical fields). On the basis of this plan of work, proposals for a system of project evaluation, covering inter alia the questions of resources and responsibility, were to be submitted to the MAB:
4. In the report 7/, presented to the MAB in February 1976, it was pointed out that what seemed to be lacking was an "Office-wide evaluation methodology, based on objective criteria; a system to ensure that all but the smallest projects are

1/ GB.185/FA/13/6.

2/ PROG/MAB/75/M.5/2.

3/ PROG/MAB/76/M.1/1.

4/ PROG/MAB/75/M.5/2.

5/ Idem.

6/ PROG/MAB/75/M.5/RD.

7/ PROG/MAB/76/M.1/1.

subjected to regular evaluation; and a system of "feedback" to ensure that the results of evaluation are fed into the design of new projects and into the planning of programmes". It also mentioned that UNDP evaluation procedures and guidelines needed to be supplemented by internal evaluation procedures and that, at a later stage, it would seem desirable to develop a common approach to and methodology for evaluation throughout the United Nations system.

5. Considering that proper evaluation depends in the first place on proper project design, it was suggested to the MAB that first priority be given to improving the design of ILO projects. To this end, it was recommended that: (a) two or three officials attend the training course of the Agency for International Development (United States) in project design and evaluation; (b) a high-level consultant be engaged to help develop with them a methodology for the design of projects; (c) they report to the MAB with firm proposals for a method and approach for project design and evaluation in the ILO; and (d) once these proposals have been approved, a massive training effort be undertaken to familiarize all concerned with the new method. It was estimated that the overall operation would take one or two years to complete. The Director-General concurred with these recommendations; (a) and (b) have already been implemented; concerning (c), the MAB, attended by heads of departments and bureaux, met on 17 March 1977, and decided to recommend to the Director-General that the ILO proceed immediately with the development and testing of a comprehensive evaluation system, covering not only technical cooperation projects, but centralized headquarters activities as well. At the end of the development and testing phase, scheduled for late 1977, a decision will be taken on the final adoption, implementation and coverage of the system.

6. Evaluation activities in ILO take various forms. Some are related directly to the organization's general programme, such as: the Medium-Term Plan and the Bi-annual Programme and Budget which establish specific objectives for future ILO actions. On the other hand, the Annual Report on Programme Implementation which is presented to the Governing Body and in-depth reviews on individual ILO programmes which are requested by the Governing Body and prepared by the services concerned, are evaluation exercises. These reviews are to be temporarily discontinued in 1978-1979 because of the backlog of reviews awaiting the Governing Body's attention. In connexion with the evaluation of technical cooperation projects, the ILO undertakes a series of exercises: reviews of the activities in given regions within a given period of time, which are presented to regional advisory committees; a review of ILO technical cooperation activities, which is submitted to the Governing Body every year and; tripartite evaluation missions (a team composed of Governing Body members from the workers', employers' and government representatives) which, within the framework of regional advisory committees, are responsible for evaluating ILO technical cooperation activities in a particular country of the region. Apart from these evaluation activities, which are requested by its supervisory bodies, ILO undertakes also some ad hoc evaluation exercises for purposes internal to the service concerned, such as the one made recently by the Employment and Development Department on its research and population activities. It also participates actively as lead agency in an inter-agency pilot study of evaluation approaches in "Rural Development". Further, since January 1976, ILO has established a Management Audit Unit whose reports cover entire programmes or operations of the Office.

Summary Assessment

7. In ILO, evaluation activities are carried out by: the Bureau of Programme Budgeting and Management, the Bureau of Economic and Social Analysis, the Bureau for the Co-ordination of Operational Activities and technical departments. All these services have stated responsibilities for evaluation, but co-ordination between them needs to be improved. There is a real need for an integrated evaluation machinery. The unit currently in charge of preparing an outline for project evaluation might be considered later as the central office for co-ordination and guidance for evaluation.

8. ILO has taken important steps towards devising a comprehensive evaluation system and it is anticipated that soon there will be a precise shape given to its organizational structure for evaluation.

Annex VIII

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION (IMCO)

Current Practices

1. Because of the relatively small size of its programme and staff, IMCO does not give priority to the evaluation of its activities, except in the broad sense that evaluation is a useful means to be employed from time to time to review the working of technical assistance programmes.
2. IMCO is a participating and executing agency of UNDP technical assistance programmes in spheres of its competence. Since IMCO has an overall responsibility for ensuring that the resources employed are utilized with maximum efficiency, evaluation studies in response to UNDP are undertaken in respect of certain field operations. The Committee of Technical Cooperation, a subsidiary body, established by the Council in 1969, deals with all questions related to technical assistance programmes and their evaluation.
3. Evaluation is not a routine, functional exercise carried out by IMCO either in its activities at headquarters or in its field operations. But, special missions are sometimes sent out to the field to assess the progress of selected projects in close contact with field experts and project managers. The evaluation missions are jointly undertaken with the funding agency, like UNDP.
4. One of the larger-scale projects under IMCO/UNDP technical assistance programmes has been the Centre of Maritime Training in Brazil. This was investigated in 1975 by a joint evaluation team, comprising outside experts. The purpose of the mission was to study the needs for future external assistance and to make recommendations. The team held extensive meetings with the management staff and trainees and examined the physical facilities of the Centre to secure the widest knowledge about the project. The visiting mission came out with detailed proposals for future expansion and continued assistance to the programme.

Summary Assessment

5. IMCO has no formal evaluation system but it meets the requirements placed upon it in this regard by UNDP. Because of the relatively small size of the organization, there is little need for an elaborate system. However, IMCO and other small organizations could undoubtedly introduce some refinement to their techniques as these are developed by others in the United Nations system.

Annex IX

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)

Current Practices

1. Most of ITU's evaluation effort is concentrated on technical assistance activities, even though some related work is undertaken in the budget and other administrative processes.
2. There is no formal definition of evaluation in the ITU. However, it is broadly understood as an objective assessment of the actual impact of a project. The need for periodic evaluation reports on the technical assistance projects is stipulated in the ITU Convention. There are two main types of technical assistance programmes for which ITU represents as an executing agency: (i) UNDP-assisted projects and (ii) Funds-in-Trust projects.
3. Usually, evaluation studies are undertaken for individual projects. And the majority of them are not amenable to strict quantitative assessments. For example, projects in the nature of advisory services, surveys, organization and development of institutions, etc., are in this category. On the other hand, activities in the field of training personnel, setting up of training standards and planning of staffing needs, etc., have been found to be easier to quantify. There are no established principles and methods for ITU's evaluation analyses, but they are being developed with experience and time.
4. The Technical Co-operation Department of the general secretariat of ITU is responsible for all questions related to technical co-operation activities. It uses studies, reports, as well as questionnaire techniques in its evaluation work. Field missions are undertaken to a lesser extent, due to financial reasons, even though they are preferable in order to achieve greater objectivity in evaluation. The impact of policy decisions and events in other sectors have been taken into account in the evaluation process.
5. Most evaluations are done within the framework of UNDP's tripartite reviews. Tripartite field evaluation missions are financed by UNDP and all other field evaluation expenses are met from the Technical Co-operation Department's budget of overhead costs.
6. The Secretary-General reports annually to the Administrative Council on several vital aspects of the development of the telecommunication systems which cover the overall efficiency of the field operations, development of human resources, the need for additional inputs, assistance requirements of the least developed countries, etc. At the annual meetings of the Administrative Council and the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference which takes place every five to eight years, broad objectives are evolved and directives are issued for the future.

Summary Assessment

7. ITU has no formal evaluation system but it meets the requirements placed on it in this regard by UNDP. Because of the relatively small size of the organization, there is little need for an elaborate system. However, ITU and other small organizations could undoubtedly introduce some refinement to their techniques as these are developed by others in the United Nations system.

Annex X

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)

Current Practices

1. UNESCO has been interested in evaluation for some time, both of impact and results, and of use of resources and of work procedures. Some evaluation activities were undertaken by experts who are external to the secretariat; others were conducted internally, by staff members. Although there is interest at all levels - from the Director-General on down - all are not advocates. There are sceptics.

2. The General Conference of UNESCO, at its fourteenth session (1966), while noting that "provisions for evaluation are being built into UNESCO's future programme and becoming a regular feature of it", recommended 1/ inter alia that:

"(a) the expertise on evaluation techniques built up over the past ten years in the social science programme of UNESCO should now be put into regular operational use, and that UNESCO seek also to take advantage of the accumulated experience of other United Nations agencies in this type of study;

(b) the term "evaluation" should be reserved for those studies that permit a rigorous scientific measurement of the effects of a project or activity; for studies which do not meet this criterion, it would be preferable to use some such term as "assessment".

This terminology, which is meant to apply to the evaluation of impact and results, is however not yet generally used in the day-to-day work of UNESCO.

3. In his report to the ninety-second session of the Executive Board 2/, the Director-General mentioned that several mechanisms and procedures were being used for evaluation and assessment, this variety being the result of the differing nature of the fields covered by UNESCO and of its modes of operation. He further said that "evaluation posits the scientific measurement of the processes and results of an action. Before it can systematically be integrated into operational projects on a wide scale, the process of programming must itself evolve in a manner which permits a proper evaluation related to a given set of programme objectives with built-in indicators to enable the measurement of performance. Pending further advances in this long-term process of improved programming measures ... selection criteria of a very pragmatic kind have been used for the evaluation of a limited number of projects". While noting that progress has been made since the General Conference of 1966, the Director-General said that the efforts undertaken were far from conclusive or fully satisfactory: mechanisms needed to be strengthened and streamlined; proper methodologies and procedures were yet to be devised. In the Director-General's opinion, "the question of evaluation and assessment ought to be, as much as possible, dealt with in a pragmatic - rather than in an abstract methodological - manner, and in close connection with the process of programme formulation based on objectives".

1/ 14C/Resolution 1.211 - Evaluation - General.

2/ 92EX/9

4. By decision 3.3 3/, the Executive Board in 1973 recommended, inter alia, that a much more systematic and coherent approach for the planning, evaluation and assessment of UNESCO's programme should be pursued; evaluation and assessment should be a continuous process to be carried out by: the responsible services of the secretariat, the inter-governmental councils and advisory committees relating to certain parts of the programme, the JIU, member States and national commissions for projects executed in their territories and external experts for certain specific programmes. It also pointed out that the success of evaluation and assessment activities was closely related to the programming activity. It further invited the Director-General "to study the possibility of entrusting some of the existing units in each programme sector with the specific task of evaluation and assessment as well as designating a central unit for the guidance, co-ordination and monitoring of these activities in the Secretariat as a whole".

5. After having examined the Draft Programme and Budget for 1977-1978 4/, the Executive Board (ninety-ninth session) 5/, in the observations to its Decision 4.2, said that "greater efforts should be made to evaluate the effectiveness of UNESCO's activities as a whole, taking into account more particularly [of] the medium-term objectives aimed at, by carrying out built-in step-by-step and ex post facto evaluation and assessment of the Organization's projects. For this purpose, the Secretariat might secure the assistance of Member States and of external experts". The "Draft Programme and Budget for 1977-1978" was submitted to the recent session of the General Conference (nineteenth session) which concluded.

6. In June/July 1975, the Director-General created two services, both directly reporting to him, which assume certain housewide functions in the broader framework of evaluation. The Bureau of Studies and Programming (BEP), which is primarily responsible for medium-term and short-term programming and for inter-sectoral programme co-ordination, has in this context functions relating to evaluation and assessment of impact and results. BEP is also responsible for the Committee for Inter-Sectoral Co-operation, which has recently created an inter-sectoral working group on evaluation with a view to Decision 4.2 of the Executive Board (ninety-ninth session) as quoted above (see paragraph 4). The other service, the Inspectorate-General (IM) is primarily concerned with management, audit and inspection, and in this context with questions relating to evaluation and assessment of the use of resources and of work procedures.

7. Activities considered as evaluation are numerous in the various sectors of UNESCO. Occasionally, some exercises constitute a systematic effort towards evaluation using a scientific approach, such as "The Experimental World Literacy Programme: A Critical Assessment", or the "International Comparative Study on the Organization of Research Units". Many ad hoc studies are carried out each year, a few of which allow the formulation of judgements concerning specific programmes. Whether these have effect on programming or management decisions is not certain in view of the many factors acting to influence such decisions. Many other exercises considered as evaluation take the form of administrative assessment or monitoring reports. Amongst these are the recently introduced quarterly reports on programme implementation prepared by each sector for the Director-General. Three elements which, in the long-run, may contribute towards the control of efficiency of the programme executing are: the annual Programme Activity

3/ 92EX/Decisions.

4/ Document 19C/5.

5/ 99EX/Decisions - June 1976.

Details (PAD); the Cost Measurement System (CMS); and the Project Management Information System (PMIS). A recent experiment took the form of a report 6/ by the Director-General to the Executive Board, which briefly stated the impacts, achievements, difficulties and shortfalls of each continuing activity in 1975-1976. It was favourably received by the Executive Board 7/ which suggested that in future this document be complementary to the Report of the Director-General. This report was further transmitted to the General Conference 8/. Other evaluation exercises relate to studies on selected topics or special reports. For example, the Executive Board of UNESCO undertakes since several years in-depth studies on specific topics and areas of work of the organization, which in many cases constitute an evaluation exercise undertaken by a body external to the secretariat.

Summary Assessment

8. While many, if not most, services are involved in "evaluation" activities of some sort, organizational structures for evaluation have not yet taken a centralized co-ordinated shape.
9. At present, there is no common understanding among all the assistant directors-general about the terms of, and indeed the use and users of evaluation.
10. Some substantive services have their own evaluation staff (the Education and the Science Sectors); others carry out activities oriented towards evaluation methodology and techniques for the use and at the request of member States, such as the Division for Socio-Economic Analysis, which has done considerable work in this field, although not oriented towards use as yet in the organization itself. The inter-sectoral working group on evaluation mentioned above intends to make use of the expertise of this Division. This is an encouraging step.
11. Two organizational units have some housewide responsibility for evaluation: the Bureau of Studies and Programming (BEP) and the Inspectorate-General (IG). This is an obvious weakness in UNESCO making progress on evaluation, since the organizational units are unsure which has the leadership. Responsibility for guidance and direction on evaluation should be clearly given to a single unit and BEP is probably the appropriate unit, in light of the present structure of UNESCO. Finally, although the Inspector was impressed by the directives on evaluation stated by the Executive Board and the Director-General, he notes that these directives are not yet fully implemented.

6/ 100EX/11.
7/ 100EX/Decisions 4.3 and 5.1.1 (1).
8/ 19C/112.

Annex XI

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION (UPU)

Current Practices

1. UPU has given attention to both project and programme evaluation in past years.
2. As a general rule, all technical assistance projects - experts' missions, training courses, fellowships - are evaluated whether they be financed by UNDP, other extra-budgetary funds or by the UPU regular budget. UPU seems to be satisfied with the tripartite evaluation mechanisms devised by UNDP and has elaborated similar mechanisms for non-UNDP projects, largely based on the findings of the Interagency Study Group on Evaluation.
3. UPU has given specific attention - and indeed has developed its own guidelines - to the evaluation of fellowships and training courses. Reports are transmitted to headquarters after the courses are completed and a detailed questionnaire is sent to fellows immediately after the course is completed and to the postal administration headquarters in the countries of participants 12 months later, in order to assess the effectiveness of training activities. A similar system is also being elaborated for the evaluation of experts' missions.
4. UPU, however, finds that questionnaires are not sufficient for acquiring a realistic picture of project implementation and that field visits by headquarters officials are often necessary.
5. As regards programme evaluation, UPU undertakes programme reviews on a regional basis, prior to each programming cycle and on a global basis before each UPU Congress (every five years).
6. Responsibilities for evaluation in UPU lie with the Technical Co-operation Division. A special section deals with the development of criteria and principles, whilst the evaluation exercises themselves are conducted by the sections in charge of expert missions and fellowships.

Summary Assessment

7. Even though UPU is a small organization, evaluation seems to be of a standing concern not only to the secretariat but also to the governing bodies who regularly request and discuss evaluation reports. UPU is also open to co-operation on evaluation exercises with other United Nations agencies (especially ITU and UNDP). Of course, it could be argued that the UPU evaluation activities are little more than the normal monitoring and reporting of field projects, but probably - because of its size - UPU does not have the need for a too sophisticated system. However, it could usefully take advantage of some evaluation techniques as they are developed for larger organizations.

Annex XII

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)

Current Practices

1. Among the organizations of the United Nations system, WHO is one of the leaders in doing work - both theoretical and practical - on evaluation and has started to develop a comprehensive evaluation process.
2. WHO gives the following definition of evaluation:

"A means towards learning from experience of the past to permit better planning for the future, or, for more specific purposes, a process of assessing the achievement of the stated objectives of a programme, its adequacy, its efficiency, and its acceptance by all parties involved, or a process for directing an activity, project or programme towards set targets throughout its evolution, while at the same time assessing its achievements, its quality and, when possible, also its impact".^{1/}
3. The purpose of evaluation is obviously the improvement of the Organization's work and impact. In the past there had been a tendency to centralize the evaluation function, but it has now been realized that everyone involved in the work of the Organization at whatever level must assume responsibilities for evaluation within his sphere of competence (i.e. Governments, the World Health Assembly, the Executive Board, the Regional Committees and the secretariat staff at headquarters, regional and country level).
4. Evaluation is seen as a participatory exercise which takes place within programme execution and not as a post mortem exercise from above. An evaluation element is systematically built-in in all phases of programme planning and delivery; this implies a continuing cycle of programming evaluation.
5. It is in the nature of the work of the Organization that activities promoted and co-ordinated by it are, in fact, implemented by Member States themselves. This makes precise quantitative measurements of results against objectives difficult. The Organization therefore does not restrict itself to quantitative aspects of evaluation alone, but also lays emphasis on qualitative aspects when assessing, for example, the setting in motion of new solutions to health problems such as the introduction of the concept of Primary Health Care, the use of locally appropriate technologies and the establishment of locally relevant research activities. The effectiveness of such processes is identifiable and to some extent measurable in terms of general orders of magnitude, even if it is not always precisely quantifiable. Thus, such an assessment can reflect the degree to which objectives are being met.
6. As evaluation is an activity which spreads through all levels of the Organization, there is a wide range of evaluation to be found in various types of documents. Broadly they fall into two categories:

^{1/} EB.57/WP/2, page 3.

(a) Ad hoc evaluation studies: For example organization studies of the Executive Board which are mainly concerned with the organizational and long-term planning aspects of the Organization's activities and; in-depth evaluation studies of specific programmes conducted by the Executive Board in close co-operation with the Governments of the countries concerned;

(b) Periodic documents. Varying degrees of evaluation elements are to be found in:

- WHO's General Programme of Work, which defines expected objectives and also output indicators for each programme;
- the preparation of the Programme-Budget which implies the formulation of detailed objectives at country, regional and headquarters levels;
- cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis;
- the annual reports of the Director-General (and similar reports by the regional directors).

7. However, all of the above would not be possible without the support of the information system. This includes the new reporting system which is the main vehicle for the transmittal of information on project and programme implementation from the field to the regional offices and to headquarters. This is a filtered system in which only the relevant information moves from country to the region and to headquarters.

8. As mentioned above, evaluation in WHO is a built-in component of project and programme planning and execution. Consequently, as there is no central evaluation unit, all operational units at country, regional and headquarters level are to be directly involved in evaluation. More general evaluation responsibilities rest within the following organs:

(a) The Executive Board's Programme Committee whose main responsibility is to review the programme of work and programme budget of the organization but which may also conduct ad hoc evaluation studies itself;

(b) The secretariat's Headquarters Programme Committee, whose mandate is to advise and assist in the development and implementation of the Organization's programme, has as one of its functions to develop, monitor and control the processes for programme evaluation.

(c) The team for the Development of Programme Evaluation, which reports to the Headquarters Programme Committee and deals with the development and introduction of the WHO principles, methods and processes for the evaluation of the Organization's programme;

(d) The evaluation focal points located in the regional offices of WHO, which work in close collaboration with the above-mentioned team.

Summary Assessment

9. The WHO evaluation process is ambitious and, though a great deal of work has been done, it is still far from being fully operational. Detailed guidelines for programme evaluation are still being tested and the new reporting system is being incrementally introduced. An assessment of the WHO evaluation process is therefore not possible at this stage. Furthermore, the relationship between the evaluation process and rational use of funds, although theoretically implicit, is not always practically explicit. The accent is on quality of operations, much more than on quantity, but quantity is a major element in a determination of cost-effectiveness. In fully implementing its evaluation process, as now planned, WHO must make certain that it will be conducive to economies or to a more rational use of funds.

Annex XIII

CURRENT USE OF EVALUATION BY THE WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO)

Current Practices

1. Evaluation is understood and applied in the WMO in a very broad sense. It is interpreted as a general appraisal of the functioning of the technical assistance programmes of the WMO and of the activities of member States in support of the WMO programmes. This is usually done as a routine task in order to ensure the operational efficiency of such programmes.
2. WMO, in the past, has been concentrating on two distinct areas for its evaluation work: (i) UNDP-assisted projects and WMO's Voluntary Assistance Programmes (VAP), and; (ii) Training programmes for meteorological personnel. The UNDP and VAP projects are closely related and are geared to develop an integrated world-wide meteorological infrastructure, while the training programmes serve as a complementary part to achieve greater effectiveness in this field. Therefore, regular and systematic evaluation has been recognized as an essential part of the technical assistance programme itself.
3. Another aspect of the evaluation process in WMO is in connexion with evaluation of the activities of member States in supporting the major WMO programmes. In particular, WMO prepares an annual status report on the implementation of its World Weather Watch Plan in which the activities of member States in supporting and implementing the Plan are evaluated.
4. WMO has been using the questionnaire technique in its evaluation work. Besides the quantitative data thus assembled, subjective assessments made by headquarters staff or the UNDP resident representative, on project planning and formulation, fellowship placement and equipment procurement, have been taken into consideration routinely in the evaluation process as far as UNDP projects are concerned. A similar technique is also used in the evaluation of the activities of member States in support of the World Weather Watch Programme.
5. As regards the concepts and principles of evaluation, the recommendations of the Interagency Study Group on Evaluation have been relied upon mostly. These concepts and criteria have been found to be valid and useful in ascertaining the effectiveness of UNDP and WMO programmes.
6. The evaluation work and its findings appear in the reports of the Evaluation Branch of the Programme Planning and Co-ordination Division. Evaluation of UNDP-assisted projects are financed from the overhead costs allocated to the organization by the UNDP.
7. Regular annual evaluation reports are submitted to the WMO Executive Committee while a quadrennial report is presented to the WMO Congress. These reports help the legislative bodies of the WMO to provide guidance for future activities, and headquarters staff take appropriate measures to improve the efficiency of their programmes.

Summary Assessment

8. WMO does not have a formal structure for evaluation other than that connected with UNDP activities. Its "evaluation" efforts take place in the normal course of their regular activities. Because of the size of the organization, there may be little need for a formal structure. The organization responds satisfactorily to the pressures of UNDP for an evaluation effort.

Annex XIV

STEPS IN EVALUATION

PHASE ONE:

Specification of the Evaluation Topic

- (i) What is the subject of the evaluation?
- (ii) What is the purpose of the evaluation? What is the objective? Does it have the potential for providing new information? New techniques? New procedures? New policies?
- (iii) Is the evaluation being undertaken at the request of an organization? At the initiative of the JIU? At the request of an inter-governmental organ?
- (iv) What are the broad criteria for the evaluation? Some of these are obvious, but in any case, the study should be objective, timely, currently applicable, designed in form and language to be easily understood. The design of the study should adhere to principles that assure the reliability of the data being gathered. It also should measure the programme or project in depth.

PHASE TWO:

Identification of Information Requirements

- (i) Formulation of initial questions about the structure, process and anticipated consequences of the programme.
- (ii) Critical assessment of these questions by persons involved in the planning and execution of the programme.
- (iii) Reformulation of questions.
- (iv) Determination of priorities for the evaluation process.

PHASE THREE:

Selection of Information-gathering Procedures and Design of Study or Survey

- (i) Selection of techniques, instruments or modes of enquiry appropriate to the study design. Are the procedures for the statistical review of the data stated clearly? Is there a clearly-conceived plan for the analysis that will be done once the data have been collected? Are the analytical procedures likely to produce meaningful statements? Does the logic or design of the study permit clearly-stated generalizations?
- (ii) Determination of sampling procedures.
- (iii) Definition of procedures generally. Are the costs for the evaluation study reasonable in light of anticipated results? Are there any unanticipated results?

- (iv) Determination of procedure for analysis.
- (v) Determination of reporting stages and formats.
- (vi) Trial for procedures.

PHASE FOUR:

Implementation of Study or Survey

- (i) Application of procedures.
- (ii) Periodic reports incorporating feedback from persons involved in programme.

PHASE FIVE:

Summary of Programme Features

- (i) Description of programme structure, process and outcomes.
- (ii) Comments by all staff or participants involved in the evaluation process.

PHASE SIX:

Judgements

- (i) Review and final selection of criteria for judgement.
- (ii) Outline of alternative strategies.
- (iii) Assessment of programme in relation to criteria and alternatives.
- (iv) Final recommendations.