

STATUS OF INTERNAL EVALUATION IN UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONS

Prepared by Earl D. Sohm
Joint Inspection Unit

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. UNITED NATIONS
- II. UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (UNICEF)
- III. UNITED NATIONS CENTRE FOR HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (HABITAT) (UNCHS)
- IV. UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (UNCTAD)
- V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTRE UNCTAD/GATT (ITC)
- VI. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)
- VII. UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)
- VIII. UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (UNFPA)
- IX. OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)
- X. UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)
- XI. FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)
- XII. INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)
- XIII. INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO)
- XIV. INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD)
- XV. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (ILO)
- XVI. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION (IMCO)
- XVII. INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)
- XVIII. UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)
- XIX. UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION (UPU)
- XX. WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (WFP)
- XXI. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)
- XXII. WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO)
- XXIII. WORLD BANK

Annex I. Selected Bibliography of Recent Documents

Annex II. Summary: Second Report on Evaluation in the United Nations System,
JIU/REP/81/6.

INTRODUCTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Evaluation is a process which attempts to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, effectiveness and impact of activities in the light of their objectives. Internal evaluation systems attempt to help maximize the effectiveness of an organization's activities by providing analytical information on results to secretariats and inter-governmental bodies to improve current and future programmes. They also provide accountability to inter-governmental bodies for effective use of resources, and stimulate general organizational interest in assessing experience and applying the lessons learned to future operations on a continuing basis.
2. In 1977 the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) made a report on the status of evaluation in the United Nations system (JIU/REP/77/1 of March 1977) which noted that little real evaluation work was being done. However, interest in evaluation, which had fluctuated since the 1950's, appeared to be at a "take-off" point and a number of organizations were developing internal evaluation systems, as discussed in Annex summaries of the evaluation activities of 13 organizations. The report, which was subsequently endorsed as an excellent starting point by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) (E/1978/12 of 31 January 1978), concluded that evaluation had considerable potential to improve operations, and that gradual progress toward more systematic evaluation was needed.
3. During 1980 the JIU made a follow-up review of evaluation status in the United Nations system. Interviews were conducted with top managers, evaluation officers, and staff of the organizations to discuss the status, structure, progress, operations and results to date of their evaluation efforts. Documents, guidelines, policy statements and reports were reviewed, recent system-wide reports were considered, the organizations' views were solicited on system-wide evaluation issues, and organization comments were obtained on the resulting draft reports.
4. This report contains one-page summaries of the status of evaluation in individual organizations, with 10 other organizations added to the 13 covered in the 1977 report. A bibliography of recent evaluation documents of the organizations is included as Annex I. Another report (JIU/REP/81/6) discusses the system-wide developments, patterns, and problems which have occurred; the relative success in establishing internal evaluation systems; and the critical stage of broad implementation which they are now entering. A summary of this overall report is included herein as Annex II.
5. Each of the one-page summaries contains standard heading data, as follows.
 - (a) "Total expenditures" represents total estimated regular budget and extra-budgetary expenditures of the organization for 1979, taken from the ACC report on system expenditures in relation to programmes (E/1979/90 of 24 October 1979, Table I) where possible, or from data provided by the organizations.
 - (b) "Total staff" represents the total number of headquarters, other established office, and project staff members (appointed for one year or more) of the organization in 1979, as taken from the ACC report on personnel statistics (ACC/-1980/PER/13 of 8 May 1980, Table I) where possible, or from data provided by the organizations.
 - (c) "Evaluation unit" is the title of the evaluation unit (or units).
 - (d) "Year established" is the year the evaluation unit was established.
 - (e) "Number of staff" is the number (or estimated proportion) of professional staff members in the evaluation unit(s) working full-time on evaluation.
 - (f) "Organizational location" is the major organizational component which the evaluation unit is (units are) a part of or to which it reports (they report), or the component where UNDP evaluation procedures are used.
 - (g) "Evaluation approach" is a capsule summary of the most important features of the organization's approach to evaluation.

6. The summaries themselves outline the basic purposes and structure of the organization, the nature of the internal evaluation system, recent activities and developments, and issues and concerns for the future. Each summary contains an assessment, many of which have suggestions on present problems and the future development of evaluation.

7. A major problem at the current stage of internal evaluation system development is the very small amount of resources devoted to evaluation unit staffing, as indicated by the heading data on the following pages relative to total expenditures and total staff. More than half the organizations have only two or one or a fraction of one evaluation officer's time. Such minimal staffing may be appropriate for initial system development and testing, but it is very doubtful that it will suffice for the much heavier training, support, analytical and reporting workload which broad-scale system implementation requires, and it could seriously hamper realization of evaluation system benefits. JIU/REP/81/6 discusses this situation in more detail, notes that staff resources could be reassigned from elsewhere in the organization, and recommends that the organizations in general carefully examine the adequacy of evaluation unit staffing to meet expanding responsibilities. The following specific recommendations, many of which concern this problem, are offered for the consideration of certain individual organizations.

a. Recommendation for the United Nations (see summary I)

The Evaluation Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs should be strengthened so that it can more expeditiously carry out its important responsibilities for evaluation in the economic and social sectors. It should maintain close association with the Programme Analysis and Evaluation Unit of the Department of Administration, Finance and Management so that there is consistency of pattern and methodologies in evaluation between these two departments.

b. Recommendation for the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)
(see summary III)

The UNCHS Monitoring and Evaluation Officer should be assigned full-time to these duties so that the present system can be further developed to meet management and reporting needs.

c. Recommendation for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
(see summary IV)

The UNCTAD Secretariat should take the initiative to develop proposals for an internal evaluation system to assist the continuing discussions of the Trade and Development Board on rationalization of UNCTAD's machinery and on programme evaluation. Such proposals could adapt other organizations' evaluation practices and use United Nations advisory assistance to strengthen UNCTAD programme management and enable its inter-governmental bodies to better assess results.

d. Recommendation for the United Nations Development Programme (see summary VI)

UNDP should designate sufficient full-time staff in the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation with responsibilities for further developing, strengthening and overseeing an effective evaluation system throughout UNDP, including the regional bureaux and field offices.

e. Recommendation for the United Nations Environment Programme (see summary VII)

UNEP should strengthen its evaluation unit in order to maintain the organization's emphasis on the importance of evaluation and develop further the usefulness of evaluation as an integral feed-back mechanism on project and programme results.

f. Recommendation for the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (see summary VIII)

UNFPA should further strengthen its project design processes and then consider the possibility of developing a built-in self-evaluation system. The additional feedback and coverage which such a system could provide could usefully supplement the present effective activities of its central Evaluation Branch.

g. Recommendation for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (see summary IX)

With its rapidly increasing activities and staff, UNHCR should make certain that sufficient attention and resources are devoted to evaluation and that evaluation activities are properly co-ordinated.

h. Recommendation for the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (see summary X)

UNIDO should determine what type of internal evaluation system would best serve the Organization and then take rapid implementation actions accordingly. This could be expedited by reactivating its evaluation committee (or establishing a new mechanism) which could co-ordinate the development and implementation of a practical UNIDO-wide internal evaluation system. The progress and results should be reviewed regularly by the Permanent Committee.

i. Recommendation for the International Atomic Energy Agency (see summary XII)

IAEA should follow through on its promising initial efforts and gradually create an integrated internal evaluation system, co-ordinated by the Office of Internal Audit and Management Services, to provide overall assessments of the status and results of its operations.

j. Recommendation for the International Civil Aviation Organization (see summary XIII), the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (see summary XVI), the International Telecommunication Union (see summary XVII), the Universal Postal Union (see summary XIX), and the World Meteorological Organization (see summary XXII)

Although these organizations do not appear to need an extensive internal evaluation system at present, they should be alert to various monitoring and evaluation techniques being developed in the UN system, and particularly to the possibility of built-in self-evaluation. Some of these techniques might be adapted to these organizations in order to improve their overall programming, assessment and reporting processes.

k. Recommendation for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (see summary XVIII)

In order to follow through on the support of the General Conference and the Executive Board for evaluation, UNESCO should strengthen as soon as possible its central evaluation unit so that its basic functions, including support, training and co-ordination can be carried out effectively. The unit's scope of authority should cover both regular and extra-budgetary programmes, and firm linkages with the programme sectors and decentralized regions should be developed. The management information system should be streamlined and integrated as part of the evaluation system effort.

l. Recommendation for the World Food Programme (see summary XX)

WFP should determine how best to strengthen its project planning, formulation, monitoring, management information and reporting processes so that the Evaluation Service's resources can be concentrated on evaluation. As part of this process, WFP should review the possibility of developing a self-evaluation system which would supplement the present effective work of its Evaluation Service.

I. UNITED NATIONS

Total expenditures: \$US 1,183,700,000 Total staff: 14,785
Evaluation unit: Evaluation Unit; Programme Analysis and Evaluation Unit
Year established: 1980; 1974 Number of staff: 3; 1
Organizational location: Department of International Economic and Social Affairs
(DIESA); Department of Administration, Finance and Management (AFM)
Evaluation approach: System under development, and central programme evaluations

The United Nations has made little progress towards an internal evaluation system since 1977, concentrating instead on strengthening programming to facilitate evaluation and on some programme evaluations. However, a new central evaluation unit began work in DIESA in 1980 to develop such a system.

The United Nations' purposes are to maintain international peace and security, develop friendly relations among nations, and co-operate in and harmonize actions to solve international problems. Its main organs are the General Assembly and its seven Main Committees; the Security Council; the Economic and Social Council with its standing committees, functional commissions, and the regional economic commissions; the Trusteeship Council; the International Court of Justice; and the Secretariat. The agencies listed in the following nine sections of this report are also part of the United Nations.

Since 1977, evaluation work has been in two general areas. First, the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) has requested a series of programme evaluation reports (*). Four such studies were conducted in 1977, two in 1978, and one each in 1979 and 1980. They appear to have been fairly well-received although their evaluation quality was somewhat uneven. Second, in response to a 1978 JIU report on programming and evaluation (*), the Secretariat has addressed itself to certain serious gaps in the existing system (*). Efforts have been started to establish internal work programmes (*) and more carefully identify outputs in the programme budget (*). An initial biennial programme performance report (*) and two reports on identification of obsolete and ineffective activities (*) have been developed and issued.

Prior to 1978, the Programme Analysis and Evaluation Unit in AFM was responsible for most evaluation work. Following the restructuring resolution (A/RES/32/197) and inter-governmental body emphasis on integrating an internal evaluation system with the programme planning process, however, responsibilities were re-organized in 1978. A new Evaluation Unit under the Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination in DIESA is responsible for evaluation studies and development of a comprehensive evaluation system in the economic and social sectors, under the guidance of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and with the aid of a high-level steering committee on evaluation composed of the heads of concerned organizational entities. This Unit will also design methodologies, assist other United Nations units, and co-operate with other United Nations system agencies in co-ordinated development of monitoring and evaluation functions in the economic and social sectors. For other sectors, the AFM Unit will be responsible for methodologies for programme evaluation, development of performance monitoring and evaluation functions, and assisting in organizing and preparing evaluation studies, as well as consulting with the DIESA Unit on the financial aspects of its evaluation work.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The United Nations has recently given serious consideration to developing programming processes in support of evaluation and to some specific programme evaluations, but it has not kept pace with most other UN system organizations and UN component agencies in developing an internal evaluation system. The new DIESA Evaluation Unit intends to work in this direction. Further progress is needed since, as the 1977 JIU report emphasized, the review work of the many United Nations inter-governmental bodies could benefit considerably from the data and techniques which an orderly and comprehensive internal evaluation system could provide.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.a.

II. UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (UNICEF)

Total expenditures: \$US 228,800,000 Total staff: 2,066
Evaluation unit: Programme Analysis and Evaluation Office
Year established: 1976 Number of staff: 4
Organizational location: Programme Division
Evaluation approach: towards collaborative decentralized self-evaluation

UNICEF's specific internal evaluation system is only now being developed, based on an evolving programme structure for integrated operations at the field level.

UNICEF's mandate is to help developing countries improve the conditions of their children and youth, through low-cost, community-oriented basic services. An Executive Board elected by ECOSOC meets annually to establish policies and review the Fund's programmes.

In 1976 UNICEF established a Programme Analysis and Evaluation Section in the Programme Division at Headquarters to provide headquarters services for and improvement of UNICEF co-operative programming activities at the country level. A concurrent review of evaluation activities also led to new review criteria (*). UNICEF assessment activities at present include some retrospective project evaluations and global assessments of major programme areas. The three professional staff in the Evaluation Section have worked mostly on strengthening programme and project preparation and design at the country level, especially through programming workshops, with less time for general evaluation activities.

Primary emphasis has thus been on decentralized programme development in a process similar to the WHO country health programming approach and more recently on information, monitoring and reporting processes. However, UNICEF interest is now shifting more towards monitoring and evaluation, and from the national level to community-based projects. UNICEF realizes that the quality of evaluation feed-back will vary considerably depending on the interests and capabilities of UNICEF staff and the host governments which they assist. It expects, however, that the programming system will lay a base for participative evaluation processes adapted to a developing country context at the "grass-roots" level. While the priorities have not been fully resolved, UNICEF would like to move towards "built-in" evaluation through continuous monitoring of implementation and performance and periodic country reviews, which can in turn support co-ordinated programme evaluation and reporting.

These developments relate also to a recent JIU report on UNICEF planning and programming at the country level (*), which UNICEF has generally endorsed (*). In addition to identifying the need for more systematic planning, programming, research, and information-gathering activities, the report found that UNICEF uses its established monitoring and evaluation procedures (*) only sporadically. It recommended strengthened, more collaborative, and more systematic monitoring and evaluation efforts to gradually develop selective national evaluation plans, a biennial report to the Executive Board on evaluations made, reinforcement of Programme Division analytical capacity, and regional advisers in programming, evaluation and statistics.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNICEF is currently working to improve its country-level programme structure and operations, and to gradually integrate built-in evaluation activities into this framework. The focus on field-level participative processes in widely-varying situations is challenging and could lead to significant innovative approaches to sub-national programming, monitoring, information and evaluation activities in developing countries.

(*) See bibliography

III. UNITED NATIONS CENTRE FOR HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (HABITAT) (UNCHS)

Total expenditure: \$US 23,800,000 Total staff: 317
Evaluation unit: Technical Co-operation Policy and Co-ordination Unit
Year established: 1979 Number of staff: 1
Organizational location: Office of the Executive Director
Evaluation approach: "Built-in" evaluation and central unit

Although it is quite new as a United Nations agency, UNCHS has done extensive work during the past two years to design and introduce a monitoring and impact evaluation system to use in assessing project and programme performance.

UNCHS was established in late 1978 to service the Commission on Human Settlements and serve as a focal point for action, co-ordination and evaluation of human settlements activities in the UN system. It assumed the former housing and human settlements functions and posts of the United Nations Secretariat and of UNEP, and also contains the United Nations Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation. Oversight is provided by annual meetings of the Commission, and the bureau of the Commission also meets biannually with the bureau of the UNEP Governing Council.

In 1978 UNCHS began a gradual pragmatic process to develop a methodology for impact evaluation, based on the UNDP project design framework integrated with UNCHS project operations. A methodology and design were discussed and developed, and two large-scale new projects were selected and restructured as test cases to apply them. Implementation of the projects began in 1979, with positive feedback from the governments concerned. A Programme Policy and Co-ordination Unit and a Technical Co-operation Policy and Co-ordination Unit were established in the Office of the Executive Director to serve as focal points for evaluation and monitoring activities and as primary programme integration and evaluation feedback mechanisms. A Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in the latter unit was given responsibility for further developing, implementing, and expanding the internal evaluation system.

In November 1980 UNCHS issued guidelines and began implementation of its Project Management System (PMS) in the Technical Co-operation Division (*). The basic phases of the system are initial project formulation and design, monitoring during implementation, and joint terminal assessment on project completion. Special emphasis is placed on client/contractor service relationships with member governments, accountability for the delivery of effective inputs and end-products, and project decision-making directed towards achieving end results. Based on experience, this system may be extended to the Regular Programme and other UNCHS activities. A more rigorous re-definition and analysis of sub-programmes under the Regular Programme has been started.

However, much remains to be done. The single evaluation officer spends only a small portion of his time at present on evaluation work because of other duties. There is still a need for training in the new system, a forward work plan, and follow-up policies and procedures. UNCHS also has yet to establish specific evaluation reporting mechanisms, perhaps through an annual performance report which could serve as a framework for improved future programming, project design and budgeting.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNCHS efforts to develop, test, and introduce an internal evaluation system during the past two years are positive steps, particularly as they have emphasized a practical system which meets UNCHS operational needs. A critical stage has been reached, however, in which a further commitment is needed with the guiding attention of a full-time evaluation officer if UNCHS is to further develop and expand the basic system and realize the management and reporting benefits which it can provide.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.b.

IV. UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (UNCTAD)

Total expenditure:	\$US 34,400,000	Total staff:	424
Evaluation unit:	None		
Year established:	Not applicable	Number of staff:	Not applicable
Organizational location:	Technical Co-operation Service		
Evaluation approach:	UNDP evaluation procedures		

Evaluation in UNCTAD has been primarily limited to technical co-operation activities with UNDP. Recently, however, consideration has been given to programme evaluation in the context of efforts to rationalize UNCTAD operations.

UNCTAD's main purposes in the international trade field are the promotion of trade to accelerate economic development, the formulation of principles and policies, initiation of action on multilateral instruments, and action as a centre to harmonize trade and development policies. Its main functions include deliberation, negotiation, review and implementation in the field of international trade and related issues of international co-operation. The Conference normally meets every four years. The Trade and Development Board, which meets biannually between Conference sessions, has six main committees as well as one special committee on preferences and inter-governmental, and expert groups.

UNCTAD's involvement in evaluation has been essentially through its UNDP-financed technical co-operation projects. UNCTAD participates extensively in the UNDP management system of monitoring, tripartite reviews and final reports, but has not developed any evaluation system of its own. However, it joined the UN and UNIDO in an evaluation exercise in the field of manufactures which was presented to CPC in May 1980 and to the UNCTAD Working Party on the Medium-Term Plan and the Programme Budget in September 1980. The Secretariat includes an Economic Policy Evaluation and Co-ordination Unit.

The question of programme evaluation in UNCTAD was raised for the first time by the Fifth Session of the Conference in 1979 in a discussion on institutional issues. The Conference requested the Board to consider the desirability of including programme evaluation in the functions of its Working Party on the Medium-Term Plan and the Programme Budget. It also requested an ad hoc inter-governmental committee on rationalization of UNCTAD's machinery to consider, taking into account, where appropriate, the views and experience of relevant bodies of the UN system, evaluation procedures and mechanisms in UNCTAD, and to recommend ways and means as to how effective evaluation could be achieved and strengthened, taking into account UNCTAD's special responsibilities such as negotiations. These matters were taken up subsequently both by the ad hoc Committee and by the Working Party, but so far no final agreement has been reached.

Concern has been expressed about UNCTAD's complex agenda of committees, meetings and documents; the many diverse activities that it has built up over the years; and the decentralized nature of its operations. UNCTAD officials felt that management co-ordination could be improved, but that detailed and cumbersome procedures and reporting should be avoided. They believe that UNCTAD has made progress recently with programme budgeting, that there is ambivalence about evaluation in the secretariat and inter-governmental bodies, and that the programme evaluation question will be tied at least partly to progress on the rationalization issue.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNCTAD could assist the continuing discussions of its Trade and Development Board on rationalization and evaluation by developing proposals for an internal evaluation system. Such a system need not be elaborate and costly nor necessarily apply to all UNCTAD activities. Its development would be greatly facilitated by applying General Assembly and other policy guidance on improved internal evaluation efforts, by adapting techniques developed by many other organizations as discussed in this Report, and through the assistance of the DIESA Evaluation Unit of the United Nations.

See recommendation in paragraph 7.c.

V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTRE UNCTAD/GATT (ITC)

Total expenditures: \$US 23,300,000 Total staff: 249
Evaluation unit: Evaluation Section
Year established: 1975 Number of staff: 2
Organizational location: Division of Programme, Resources and External Relations
Evaluation approach: Mixed ad hoc team missions and consultants

ITC, despite its small size, has gained considerable experience in recent years in project evaluation. It is now extending its system to cover all major facets of its programme.

ITC is the United Nations focal point for trade promotion efforts in developing countries. It is jointly sponsored by UNCTAD and GATT, and oversight is provided by a Joint Advisory Group (JAG) and a Technical Committee. In 1975, ITC introduced a project evaluation system (*) for all its integrated trade promotion projects financed by trust funds, and established an Evaluation Section. The system is based on annual progress reviews at headquarters, mid-term review missions, and terminal evaluations at project completion or before shifting to a new phase. The evaluations are conducted by teams representing the host government, the financing agency, and one or two headquarters staff members not directly involved in the project,

In 1978, ITC re-organized its Secretariat based on a study which emphasized the need to improve programme planning capacity, provide a clearer focus on operations, and build in a staff development programme. Concurrently, it was decided to expand the scope of the evaluation system (*). Project evaluation - extended to cover all categories of field projects - remains the largest component. ITC is also introducing a "built-in" evaluation system, evaluating one of its ten programmes each year as a basis for JAG discussion, and initiating evaluations of headquarters activities. The JAG and governments involved with ITC have been supportive of the evaluation efforts, and have also requested more extensive reporting on the results of project evaluation activities. The Director, for his part, has stressed the need for a strengthened project management process, and a new programming and monitoring unit has been established.

Many ITC staff members have been involved in the team evaluation process, which is regarded as a useful training and development exercise. Those interviewed felt that the system has worked well to assess project results and improve new phases. They did caution that evaluation must not become routine or be taken for granted, and that improved follow-up is needed to ensure that recommendations are acted upon and that evaluation findings are linked with new project design. The Evaluation Section, which has been given such follow-up and general feedback responsibilities, is also engaged in the expansion of the system, the initial programme and headquarters evaluations, and development of guidelines for the new "built-in" evaluation component. Greater participation by senior officials in evaluation missions is being encouraged, with consultants being used for the programme and headquarters evaluations as these functions are tested and developed further.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: ITC seems to have made excellent progress, particularly as a small organization, in the establishment and use of a project evaluation system through active participation and support by staff, senior officials and government representatives involved in ITC work. The substantial challenges which it is now addressing are to expand this system to the rest of the ITC programme, improve linkages with the rest of the project and programme management cycle, further develop follow-up and reporting processes, and in general ensure that evaluation is an effective process to improve the results of ITC trade promotion work.

(*) See bibliography

VI. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)

Total expenditures: \$US 698,000,000 Total staff: 5,155
Evaluation unit: Division for Programme Development, Support and Evaluation
Year established: 1967 Number of staff: 1
Organizational location: Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation (BPPE)
Evaluation approach: Centralized "thematic" evaluations and decentralized project evaluations

Recent UNDP evaluation efforts have mainly focused on "thematic" evaluations, but it is also in the process of strengthening its individual project evaluation system.

UNDP finances more than 8,000 technical co-operation projects, mostly executed by UN system organizations. They assist over 145 developing countries and territories to accelerate their economic and social development towards the goal of self-reliance by mobilizing or enhancing their human and institutional capacities, identifying natural resources and through the transfer and exchange of technology and skills. The Administrator of UNDP, who heads a secretariat which includes 112 field offices, is responsible for all aspects of UNDP activities to a Governing Council of 48 Member States, which reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC.

The Governing Council has periodically emphasized evaluation and feedback as important components in the efforts to ensure high standards in technical co-operation (*). UNDP evaluations are conducted at two levels of aggregation, (a) evaluation of projects individually and (b) theme evaluations of selected subject matter areas. UNDP has been consulting with the agencies with a view to strengthening project evaluation activities by careful selection of projects for evaluation, improved project design and reporting, and strengthened tripartite project reviews, leading to revision of the current UNDP project evaluation guidelines (*). The Administrator will report to the Governing Council on these matters at the June 1981 session. UNDP is also establishing an explicit feedback mechanism to disseminate the lessons learned from evaluations and is implementing an Integrated Systems Information Project (ISIP) to improve project and programme data for overall management supervision purposes, including evaluation.

The theme evaluations were introduced in 1977. They analyze technical co-operation experience in specific areas to determine factors leading to success or failure and improve the design and implementation of new projects (*). As of mid-1980, 12 substantive studies and two process studies were completed (*) or underway in co-operation with eight other agencies, and another five are expected for the 1980-82 period. Feedback mechanisms include published reports, new programme guidance, training and special follow-up measures where needed. The completed studies were well received, although some appear to have been rather broad in character and some difficulties have been experienced in obtaining the required data.

Individual project evaluation responsibility in UNDP is presently decentralized to the regional bureaux, field offices, executing agencies and governments. The theme evaluations are the responsibility of BPPE with one person serving part-time as senior evaluation co-ordinator and other BPPE technical advisers taking an active part in studies in their respective fields of competence. However, BPPE responsibilities for overall evaluation system development, oversight, training, and follow-up are unclear, and the regional bureaux evaluation approaches vary from a formal unit to emphasis on design to little specific activity.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNDP has made considerable progress in developing the programme of joint thematic evaluations, but the status and structure of its internal evaluation system is still rather informal and uncertain. UNDP needs sufficient full-time staff in BPPE to further develop, strengthen and monitor an orderly system, as well as specific focal points in the regional bureaux. Because UNDP's evaluation activities and leadership are so important on a system-wide basis, the strengthening of its individual project evaluation system is also discussed separately in the concurrent second JIU report on evaluation in the United Nations system (JIU/REP/81/6).

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.d.

VII. UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)

Total expenditures: \$US 41,000,000 Total staff: 415
Evaluation unit: Fund Policies and Evaluation Section
Year established: 1975 Number of staff: 2
Organizational location: Office of the Environment Fund and Administration
Evaluation approach: Primarily centralized evaluations by consultants

UNEP has developed a variety of evaluation efforts since 1976 with strong Governing Council support, but recently progress has slowed.

UNEP was created as a small co-ordinating body and catalyst within the UN system to facilitate international co-operation, review the world situation and problems, and promote the flow and assessment of knowledge in the environmental field. It is comprised of a Governing Council which meets annually, the secretariat, and an Environment Fund which provides additional financing for environmental programmes.

In 1975 UNEP established an evaluation unit, located in the Fund but reporting directly to the Deputy Executive Director on all evaluation matters. In addition to liaison work with UNDP and policies and procedures development, the unit spends most of its time on project evaluation activities and assessment reporting to governments. The Governing Council has shown considerable interest in evaluation, and in 1977 stressed the need for programme as well as project evaluation, more reporting on the type of evaluation used and results achieved, and emphasis in Fund Project documentation on objectives, expected impact, progress, and results achieved.

About 25 "in-depth" evaluations have been conducted of Fund projects, groups of projects, and supporting processes, primarily by consultants working with the staff and in consultation with other involved organizations and governments, and an in-depth report on the environment programme was made for CPC in 1977. About 10 in-depth and 100 desk evaluations of completed projects and other activities are expected annually. The unit is informally linked with the project appraisal and internal review processes, and reporting has been a particularly important responsibility. Individual evaluation reports are summarized in the bi-monthly "Report to Governments", and an annual report on evaluation activities has been prepared since 1976 at the Governing Council's request (*).

Further evaluation system development, however, is hampered by the complexity of UNEP programming, with its three programme levels and co-ordinative and catalytic emphases, as reflected in UNEP efforts to develop a system-wide medium-term environment programme (*). In addition, UNEP evaluations have shown the need for better project design, statements of objectives, monitoring, follow-up and use of results. Little has been done to develop programme evaluation, and Governing Council interest in evaluation seems to have diminished. The small evaluation unit appears to be overburdened with tasks, resulting in some further slippage of evaluation activities.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: As a result of strong Governing Council interest and secretariat leadership and action, UNEP began evaluation activities which have been favourably noted elsewhere in the system. Recently, however, its evaluation efforts appear to be losing momentum, primarily because of the difficulty of further developing its complex programming responsibilities and its programme management processes. UNEP should not lose sight of its stated emphasis on evaluation as an important and integral feedback mechanism on project and programme results, and should consider strengthening its small evaluation unit while retaining its important reporting functions.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.e.

VIII. UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (UNFPA)

Total expenditures: \$US 131,600,000 Total staff: 197
Evaluation unit: Evaluation Branch
Year established: 1972 Number of staff: 5
Organizational location: Under Deputy Executive Director
Evaluation approach: Centralized, independent evaluation by evaluation staff and consultants

Evaluation in UNFPA is a relatively mature process. Current interest focuses on how to extend evaluation coverage and further improve internal feedback.

UNFPA is a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly with the purpose of assisting developing countries in solving their population problems. It works closely with governments, UN system organizations, regional groups and non-governmental organizations. The Governing Council of UNDP serves as its governing body.

The UNFPA Evaluation Branch is an independent, centralized unit with five professional staff who report to the Deputy Executive Director. Its objectives are to help provide accountability to the Governing Council for funds entrusted to UNFPA and to provide a basis for future management decision-making. The Branch performs about six evaluations a year, using its own staff and consultants to study the performance and effects of selected activities in-depth. Because of the emphasis on independence, other UNFPA, executing agency, and recipient government staff are considered important resource persons for the evaluations, but are not members of evaluation missions.

Individual evaluation reports are considered to be reports to UNFPA with comments by governments and executing agencies. These reports are normally not published. However, summaries of these reports and of UNFPA's evaluation work are submitted regularly to the Governing Council, most recently in 1978 and 1980 (*), in what will become a biennial reporting process. Both reports were well-received and were credited for their objectivity and frankness, with recognition that problems as well as successes were addressed and that actions were being taken thereon to ensure that future operations run smoothly. Another recent development is a gradual shift away from evaluations of global and regional programmes towards more evaluation of country programmes, as the overall UNFPA emphasis also shifts that way.

UNFPA evaluation appears to have good general support by staff, leadership and the Governing Body. They have all, however, expressed a need for more evaluations to cover the 1,500 UNFPA-assisted projects which exist, and for shorter time-spans than the year or more which the average study now requires. Since UNFPA is concerned with weaknesses in project design and unclear objectives, based inter alia on UNFPA evaluations, it has issued revised project preparation instructions to improve this situation (*). In addition, while the overall UNFPA programming, review and monitoring process and structure is considered fairly adequate, there is interest in more effective and timely internal feedback processes to ensure improved future project management. The Executive Director has told the Governing Council that evaluations will be carried out with increased emphasis in the future, but it seems that in the near future the Evaluation Branch will not increase its present size very much, relying instead on more use of consultants.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Evaluation appears to have become a well-established and useful process in UNFPA, which is understood by the staff, top management, and the Governing Council. While the accountability function is felt to be adequately fulfilled, however, there is a demand from all these groups for more internal feedback through an increase in the number and speed of evaluation studies, improvement or development of new feedback mechanisms to provide intermediate analysis of specific problems to ensure timely corrective actions, or both. Given staff resource constraints and the desire to maintain the in-depth nature of the current independent evaluations, this will be a particular challenge.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.f.

IX. OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)

Total expenditures: \$US 281,900,000 Total staff: 829
Evaluation unit: Project Evaluation Unit; Policy, Planning and Research Unit
Year established: 1980; 1980 Number of staff: 1; 1
Organizational location: Assistance Division; under High Commissioner
Evaluation approach: Project evaluation; central policy/strategy evaluation

UNHCR is currently in a transition period from a single Evaluation Officer post, primarily used for management studies, towards a new structure involving both project and policy/strategy evaluation.

In the early 1970s UNHCR created an Evaluation Officer to report to the High Commissioner and provide "systematic evaluation at the highest level of results achieved". During 1975-79, the Officer reappraised rural refugee settlement policies, led the initial development of a project management system, and performed many management analyses. In 1978, the post was moved to the Division of Administration and Management, and in late 1979 the incumbent moved to a field post.

UNHCR has moved to fill the resulting evaluation gap in two ways. First, a new project management system (PMS) came into general use in 1980 to strengthen planning, programming and project management for all new projects in the Assistance Division (*). A Project Evaluation Unit was established in October 1980 to gradually and systematically develop and implement project evaluation within the PMS. Initial efforts are directed towards strengthening project design and staff understanding of evaluation through guidelines, workshops and consultations. A self-evaluation component is being tested which will be built-in to project design to allow managers to analyze discrepancies between project objectives and actual achievements and derive lessons learned. In-depth mid-term and final evaluations of selected projects by small teams of staff and consultants are also being considered, as well as analytical and follow-up processes focusing on evaluation findings and results.

In addition a new Policy, Planning and Research Unit began operations in May 1980, with three professional staff who report to the High Commissioner. The Unit is responsible for periodic reappraisal of long-term policy objectives and provision of long-term planning, research and advice, drawing on available internal and external expertise. Among its initially-stated functions are those of selective evaluation of existing policies and strategies, and the orderly accumulation and appropriate use of lessons of UNHCR's experience.

UNHCR officials noted that the uncertainties, heavy operational pressures, and tremendous growth in emergency refugee programmes have made planning and evaluation difficult, the more so as UNHCR staff and programmes have had to expand rapidly to meet these needs. The Executive Committee has urged more systematic monitoring, but UNHCR officials also recognize the value of orderly feedback of lessons learned through evaluation. They suggested that UNHCR could gradually work towards a system combining project evaluation, programme evaluation at the country level, and - most difficult - evaluation at the policy level.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNHCR's new project management system provides a good basis for an orderly and systematic process to determine programme results. Further progress will require development of the project evaluation approach in the Assistance Division, and a conscious effort by the new Policy Planning and Research Unit to ensure that its evaluation responsibilities are not lost among other functions. UNHCR will also need to gradually connect these two functions with evaluation at the programme level and to designate a specific overall co-ordination point, if it is to achieve an integrated and effective internal evaluation system.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.g.

X. UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)

<u>Total expenditures:</u> \$US 98,900,000	<u>Total staff:</u> 1,012
<u>Evaluation unit:</u> Evaluation Unit	
<u>Year established:</u> 1976	<u>Number of staff:</u> 2
<u>Organizational location:</u> Policy Co-ordination Division	
<u>Evaluation approach:</u> Joint evaluations with UNDP, system under development	

UNIDO has made little progress towards an internal evaluation system in the past few years, devoting most of its limited evaluation effort to joint thematic evaluations with UNDP.

The purposes of UNIDO are to promote and accelerate the industrialization of the developing countries and to co-ordinate the industrial development activities of the United Nations system. When Member States ratify UNIDO's constitution it will become a specialized agency. At present, its policy-making organs are the General Conference which meets quadrennially, the Industrial Development Board, which meets annually and reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC, and its Permanent Committee, which meets twice a year.

The UNIDO Evaluation Unit was created in 1976 to design, test, install, and monitor a comprehensive evaluation system, with implementation expected by late 1977, and to conduct specific evaluations. Proposals for a system were developed in 1977 and 1978 and presented to the Permanent Committee in early 1979 (*). Documents such as the current programme budget (1980-81) have established an extensive work programme of project, programme, and desk evaluations and reviews. Most of the work of the small (one professional) Evaluation Unit, however, has been devoted to several joint thematic evaluations with UNDP and other agencies, and follow-up on these studies.

UNIDO officials felt that the thematic evaluations had contributed to better understanding of evaluation in UNIDO and its potential contribution to improved performance. They noted that during 1980 a design and evaluation glossary was issued, structured feedback mechanisms developed and used for the thematic evaluations, special in-depth evaluation methodologies developed for field projects, and efforts begun to define evaluation system roles more clearly. They believed that with some thematic studies completed and added Evaluation Unit staff (in late 1980 a second officer was assigned and a third being recruited), needed attention could now be given to installing an internal system. Other officials, however, were concerned that evaluation development had lost momentum and did not have adequate support, and stressed the need to work on a co-operative basis to develop a simple and useful built-in self-evaluation system tailored to UNIDO's needs.

A March 1980 report to the Permanent Committee stated that design work had not yet begun on the major self-evaluation component, but that the internal evaluation system would still be implemented during the 1980-81 biennium (*). The Committee urged intensified efforts to develop the system design for internal evaluation - without impairing other UNIDO activities and within approved programme allocations - with top management involvement and a real linkage with other programme management processes, countries aided by UNIDO, and UNIDO field staff.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Despite its promising start, UNIDO has now fallen behind its earlier goals for developing and implementing an internal evaluation system. The major problem seems to be a lack of consensus on what such a system should be. To recapture momentum, UNIDO needs a high-level joint mechanism - perhaps its presently-inactive evaluation committee - to co-operatively develop and implement a practical UNIDO-wide internal evaluation system, and ensure that evaluation is viewed by senior management as an essential element of the decision-making process above the division level. This should be accompanied by a strong demonstration of governing body support for orderly evaluation of UNIDO activities and their improvement.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.h.

XI. FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)

Total expenditures: \$US 358,300,000

Total staff: 6,637

Evaluation unit: Evaluation Service

Year established: 1968

Number of staff: 8

Organizational location: Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation

Evaluation approach: Independent and "auto-evaluation" on a decentralized basis

Despite already having a long-established evaluation process, FAO has taken considerable strides to make its internal evaluation system more comprehensive in the past few years, in response to FAO Conference emphasis on using evaluation more to focus on programme effectiveness.

FAO's purposes are to raise levels of nutrition and standards of living, improve the efficiency of production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, and to better the conditions of rural populations. FAO is governed by its Conference which normally meets biannually, and a Council which supervises FAO work between conferences, particularly through its Programme and Finance Committees.

There have been two major developments in FAO evaluation work since 1978, designed to produce an internal evaluation system with mutually-supporting elements. First, auto-evaluation was introduced in 1978 as a built-in periodic activity (*) by programme managers at all levels to review progress achieved and problems encountered, so as to facilitate timely corrections. The system provides direct feedback to the managers, an important basis for future policy decisions, and an identification of problem areas for further study by the Evaluation Service or other units as appropriate. The second development is the introduction of the Review of the Regular Programme, first published in 1979 as a biennial performance report, including in-depth reviews of selected sub-programmes (*). While the limitations of the initial effort were acknowledged, the Director-General emphasized its value as a mutual learning process, and to provide high-level management and governing bodies with information on the relevance, impact and efficiency of FAO programmes and activities. In future the report may be combined with the biennial Review of Field Programmes, which was itself revised in 1979 to focus more on programme impact (*).

In conjunction with these broadened evaluation activities, the Evaluation Service was moved in 1978 from the Development Department to the Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation in the Office of the Director-General. The Service is thus responsible for the evaluation of field and headquarter activities. It conducts special desk and field evaluations, reviews other evaluation reports, prepares the Review of the Regular Programme report, develops methodology and guidelines (*), and performs advisory, training and liaison functions. It thus acts as a focal point within a decentralized system which uses auto-evaluation, central evaluation, and various other types of evaluation to provide a flexible and pragmatic evaluation process.

There is considerable interest in monitoring and evaluation in the rural development field as an outgrowth of the 1979 World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, and on more co-operative work with national institutions and governments in evaluation. More attention is being placed on the development of FAO's monitoring and management information systems, the need for better achievement and impact indicators and project design, expanded evaluation training, good field management systems, and improved evaluation feedback mechanisms. These changes in emphasis represent an important development in FAO's evaluation system.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: FAO has made substantial additional progress in the past two years in expanding its evaluation system to the Regular Programme, implementing a new auto-evaluation system, and developing a new report to assess overall programme performance. These actions appear to have considerable potential for strengthening FAO operations and accountability in a comprehensive and systematic way.

(*) See bibliography

XII. INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)

Total expenditures: \$US 86,300,000 Total staff: 1,356
Evaluation unit: Office of Internal Audit and Management Services (co-ordinator);
Safeguards Evaluation Section; Evaluation Unit (Technical Assistance)
Year established: (1980); 1978; 1980 Number of staff: 1; 8; 1
Organizational location: Departments of Administration; Safeguards;
Technical Assistance and Publications
Evaluation approach: At present, evaluation development units

In the past, IAEA has relied on UNDP evaluation procedures for its technical co-operation work and an extensive network of review processes for its other programmes. Recently, however, efforts have begun to develop evaluation activities in several programme areas.

IAEA's basic purpose is to accelerate and enlarge the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The General Conference meets annually and as needed, while a Board of Governors meets quarterly. In addition, however, IAEA has a high-level Scientific Advisory Group, standing advisory bodies, many ad hoc expert committees and working groups, and an External Auditor active in programme assessment. Internally, it is within the competency of the Office of Internal Audit and Management Services to assess programmes and management as well as financial matters, and standing committees oversee major management functions. These various processes use a variety of methods and approaches, to which new evaluation efforts are now being added.

The Department of Safeguards established a Safeguards Evaluation Section in 1978 to improve the effectiveness of safeguards through review and evaluation of inspection reports and statements, preparation of an annual implementation report, and the planning and introduction of a systematic and comprehensive evaluation process. The 8-person staff has also been working towards developing the necessary technical evaluation methodology, ensuring that evaluation is integrated with planning and design in the Department, improving data collection and analysis procedures, and strengthening its computer capability.

IAEA has long utilized UNDP evaluation procedures for the one-third of its technical co-operation procedures financed by UNDP and informally applied them to its own projects as well, but in 1980 it was decided to develop a more organized system in this area. A one-person Evaluation Unit was established in the programme co-ordination section of the Department of Technical Assistance and Publications. A new implementation report was introduced in 1978 to supplement the annual technical assistance activity report, which will be supported in turn by a new computer-based management information system to replace the present cumbersome manual status system. New project appraisal forms emphasizing clear objectives and performance measurement have been applied for 1980, inter-disciplinary country programming and review missions are being mounted, and it is hoped that an institutionalized project memory will be developed.

- An interest in more formal evaluation is also developing in other areas. For instance, it was decided in 1979 to strengthen the design and evaluation of the International Nuclear Information System (INIS) through a new methodology and information format focusing on services and products produced, and through an evaluation every few years of the programme and its future development by its Advisory Committee. To co-ordinate all these evaluation activities, an officer was added to the Office of Internal Audit and Management Services in December 1980.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: IAEA has a healthy situation for evaluation at present, with a number of initiatives being taken in various key areas to develop new approaches and systems. The challenge will be to gradually expand the systematic and formalized efforts for internal evaluation to all areas and to integrate them with existing oversight processes.

See recommendation in paragraph 7.i.

XIII. INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO)

Total expenditures: \$US 63,800,000 Total staff: 1,200
Evaluation unit: Technical Support and Evaluation Section
Year established: 1973 Number of staff: 1
Organizational location: Technical Assistance Bureau
Evaluation approach: UNDP evaluation procedures

There has been no basic change in ICAO evaluation activities in the past few years, with evaluation still confined to technical assistance activities with UNDP. As a result of recent ICAO Council interest, however, the opportunity exists for some expansion of evaluation activities and increased reporting on programme results.

ICAO is primarily an inter-governmental regulatory organization in the field of international civil aviation. Its direction is provided by the Assembly which meets at least once every three years and its activity is monitored by a Permanent Executive Council which, with its subsidiary bodies, meets regularly throughout the year.

With regard to the Technical Assistance activity of ICAO, which is entirely financed through external sources such as UNDP and Trust Funds, the Technical Support and Evaluation Section of the Technical Assistance Bureau is responsible for final assessment of project reports, training activities and equipment needs, and general planning and field support work in the Technical Assistance Bureau. Only a small proportion of the staff's time is devoted to specific evaluation work, which is carried on under the UNDP evaluation guidelines. A number of evaluations have been conducted of projects, programmes, and project management processes, but major emphasis is placed on project assessment through the tripartite review process and close operating contact with field project staff. ICAO officials felt that an important general future need would be greater involvement of host governments in technical cooperation evaluation activities.

At the March 1980 meeting of the ICAO Council, representatives noted during a general discussion of evaluation that the ICAO "evaluation" system was tied in with triennial budget preparation, and that a complementary process between budget reviews could ensure better co-ordination and improve budgetary procedures. It was also felt that while Technical Assistance activities had grown rapidly, the Council played no part in their evaluation, and that it should be given more information in order to evaluate the programme, determine whether it was being carried out well, and determine whether criteria should be modified for the future. The Council requested the Secretary-General to report to the Finance Committee on the criteria used in the "evaluation" process of the regular programme, and to study ways of transmitting information to the Council on Technical Assistance activities.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: As a primarily regulatory organization, ICAO does not appear to need an extensive internal evaluation system. In the light of evaluation techniques and approaches being developed elsewhere in the UN system and the recent Council interest in improved assessment and reporting, however, ICAO should consider some of the more simple and practical evaluation techniques available, particularly as they might be useful to strengthen its overall budgeting, programming and reporting.

See recommendation in paragraph 7.j.

XV. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (ILO)

<u>Total expenditures:</u> \$US 154,700,000	<u>Total staff:</u> 2,684
<u>Evaluation unit:</u> Evaluation Unit	
<u>Year established:</u> 1977	<u>Number of staff:</u> 3
<u>Organizational location:</u> Bureau of Programming and Management	
<u>Evaluation approach:</u> Self-evaluation complemented by selective in-depth evaluations	

ILO has been developing a comprehensive internal design and evaluation system, which is now shifting from design, testing and training phases to implementation.

The purposes of ILO are to advance the cause of social justice, improve labour conditions and living standards, and promote economic and social stability, primarily through standard-setting, publications and information activities, and technical co-operation programmes. ILO has a tripartite structure in which employers and employees as well as governments participate. The International Labour Conference meets annually and the Governing Body meets three times a year.

ILO review and evaluation activities include in-depth programme reviews, regional activity reviews, and tripartite evaluation missions to countries, with a general tendency towards programme-level evaluation. It was recognized that a systematic and comprehensive internal evaluation of individual activities was missing, so development of such an approach began in 1977. It features careful definition of objectives, criteria of success, and project indicators at the design stage; applicability not only to technical co-operation projects but to other activities such as research or internal administration; and self-evaluation by those who implement the projects to permit broad coverage and facilitate feedback.

A small central evaluation unit, expanded in 1980 from one to three professional staff, was established in 1977 in the Bureau of Programming and Management to act as a service unit for this system. It concentrated initially on developing the basic procedures for design and evaluation, published in 1979 (*), and on improving project design through consultations with staff. Beginning in 1979, the new design format was applied - at first experimentally and then routinely - to selected larger-scale technical co-operation and research projects and was used to assist in preparing the 1980-81 and 1982-83 programme and budget proposals. During 1980, training seminars were held for about 280 ILO and other officials (including 68 national officials and donor agency representatives) in Geneva and the regions, design consultations continued, and initial procedures were developed for feedback of evaluation information.

During 1981 system coverage will continue to expand. The conduct of evaluations, collection of information obtained, and dissemination of findings should eventually lead to routine evaluation of a substantial number of ILO projects, facilitate knowledge transfers and identification of major constraints among various types of projects and geographical areas, and serve as a basis for broader programme evaluations. A preliminary report was prepared on technical co-operation activities in November 1980 (*), and summary information on patterns of evaluation findings may also eventually be used in the annual performance report and other review activities. While activities such as standard-setting or seminars may prove difficult to evaluate formally, it is hoped that the evaluation system can also help improve these activities as well. ILO wants its evaluation system to be a useful and reasonable management tool, rather than an elaborate process conducted for its own sake.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: ILO has carefully prepared the groundwork for its internal evaluation system, with emphasis on the development of procedures, improvement of project design, and formal and informal training of staff in applying the new system. It appears to have been successful in these development efforts thus far, and now faces the critical challenge of gradually implementing the evaluation system to determine results and improve future programmes.

(*) See bibliography

XVI. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION (IMCO)

Total expenditures: \$US 10,800,000 Total staff: 265
Evaluation unit: None
Year established: Not applicable Number of staff: Not applicable
Organizational location: Technical Co-operation Division
Evaluation approach: UNDP evaluation procedures

IMCO, as was true in 1977, does not have an internal evaluation system. Evaluation activity is limited to joint efforts for some of the technical co-operation projects which IMCO conducts as the executing agency for UNDP. IMCO inter-governmental bodies, however, do have a rather considerable and continuing involvement in the development, conduct and review of its work.

IMCO's biennial work programme and budget and long-range work programme are directed towards the development of international standards on technical and related matters affecting international shipping and provision of assistance for implementing these standards. Its institutional machinery for this purpose consists not only of the biennial Assembly and the Council, which meets twice a year, but of four major committees and an extensive network of sub-committees. These committees and bodies are composed of representatives of member governments and operate on work programmes duly considered and approved by the Council or Assembly of IMCO as the case may be. Thus, while there is no unit established specifically for the function of evaluation, the ongoing sequence of meetings provides a continuing and extensive review of the work programme. IMCO officials also noted that each secretariat unit contributed to the review and reporting process in respect of the work of the committees serviced by it.

For operational activities carried out through IMCO's technical co-operation programme the UNDP's evaluation procedures are used. In addition a committee on technical co-operation composed of representatives of member governments reviews the programme at meetings which are held twice every year. A few joint project evaluations have been conducted in the past, but in general IMCO officials believe that special evaluations are too costly to be undertaken independently. Instead, particular emphasis is placed on project monitoring on a continuing basis. The officials hope that the UNDP tripartite reviews can be given additional emphasis in the future to serve more as an evaluation function.

In his comments on the first JIU evaluation report in late 1977, the Secretary-General stated that IMCO appeared to have no need of an elaborate evaluation system because of its small size, beyond the technical co-operation requirements of UNDP. He also observed that IMCO and other small organizations could undoubtedly introduce some refinements to their techniques as they would be developed by others in the UN system, and that IMCO would seek, where appropriate, JIU advice on the establishment of a simple, effective and economical evaluation system. IMCO officials felt that the review and assessment needs of IMCO were being adequately met, but expressed a continuing interest in evaluation developments in other organizations of the UN system.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: IMCO does not appear to need an elaborate internal evaluation system at present, partly because of the extensive participation of inter-governmental bodies in its work programme. However, since IMCO also does not have a management services unit and its internal auditor deals with fund management rather than programme questions, IMCO should give continuing consideration to evaluation ideas, approaches, and techniques being developed by other UN system organizations both large and small, in order to find and adapt those which could be simply and effectively applied to improve its overall programming, assessment and reporting processes.

See recommendation in paragraph 7.j.

XVII. INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)

Total expenditures: \$US 70,000,000

Total staff: 886

Evaluation unit: None

Year established: Not applicable

Number of staff: Not applicable

Organizational location: Technical Co-operation Department

Evaluation approach: UNDP evaluation procedures

ITU does not have an internal evaluation system, except for efforts in the technical co-operation area with UNDP. Organization plans for the next several years do not envisage establishing such a system.

Unlike most other international organizations, ITU does not have a programme structure or programme budget, thus inhibiting an overall evaluation system. Its four permanent organs - the General Secretariat, International Frequency Registration Board, International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT), and the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) - share services and working facilities and co-ordinate their work formally through the Coordination Committee as constituted in the International Telecommunication Convention. Guidance is provided by the Plenipotentiary Conference which normally meets once every five years (next in 1982), Administrative Conferences, an Administrative Council, and the Plenary Assemblies of the CCITT and CCIR.

The Plenipotentiary Conferences establish the overall objectives for ITU work, which the Administrative Council, supported by the four Permanent Organs, oversees. Council meetings also receive and discuss the Secretary-General's annual report, examine the financial statements and budgets, and review personnel and administrative matters. Other than its external auditors, however, ITU has only one staff member engaged in trying to develop cost analyses of budgets and final accounts, based on other organizations' cost measurement systems and the Plenipotentiary Conference request that, as and when appropriate, cost-benefit analysis be prepared and submitted to the Administrative Council. A working party is also currently investigating possible improvements in budget format and content in advance of the 1982 Plenipotentiary Conference. ITU officials doubted that the very tight budget policy would allow for increased staffing to significantly expand these budgetary or any other management programming and analysis processes.

ITU evaluation activity is confined to the Technical Co-operation Department and is very reliant on UNDP programming and evaluation procedures and leadership. ITU officials feel that the substance of their project assessment work is very close to evaluation emphases on a learning process to determine results, but impact evaluation is felt to be too complex for ITU resources. Primary emphasis is placed on UNDP tripartite reviews and missions. At present, ITU has only half-a-dozen financial people and about 40 technical professionals to manage some 200 technical co-operation projects which are getting more and more complex. The Administrative Council is very interested in close analysis of technical co-operation activities, and in 1979 it decided to create a special working group to reassess all aspects of the ITU efforts.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: ITU does not appear at present to need an elaborate evaluation system, particularly in view of its complicated organizational structure. As it reviews its present very basic budgetary and technical co-operation procedures and develops "cost-benefit" analyses, however, ITU should consider the various basic monitoring, programming and evaluation techniques being developed by other UN system organizations which might be used to improve its budgetary, assessment and reporting processes.

See recommendation in paragraph 7.j.

XVIII. UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)

Total expenditure: \$US 224,900,000 Total staff: 3,365.
Evaluation unit: Central Evaluation Unit
Year established: 1978 Number of staff: 2
Organizational location: Bureau of Studies and Programming
Evaluation approach: Integration with planning, programming and budgeting
processes; and de-centralized self-evaluation

In 1978 the UNESCO Executive Board established guidelines for an internal evaluation system (*) to be integrated with the planning, programming and budgeting process; introduced gradually and systematically; and de-centralized and based on self-evaluation. A central evaluation unit was established to organize and systematize initial evaluations in the programme sectors; provide encouragement, support, training, and co-ordination; establish evaluation norms, criteria and methods; - and to follow-up on the use of evaluation results.

Significant initial steps have been taken. A new performance monitoring system emphasizing the financial resources, outputs and results of programme actions is an integral part of the 1981-1983 Programme and Budget (*). A UNESCO-wide evaluation glossary has been issued (*). The evaluation content of the biennial major impacts/shortfalls report has been increased, and action begun to improve the evaluative quality of other existing UNESCO reporting processes.

As noted in an evaluation status report to the 1980 General Conference (*), however, much remains to be done. The use of evaluation to clarify statements of objectives, themes and expected results will be a critical step in preparing the next Medium-Term Plan and future Programme and Budget documents. Internal guidelines for design and evaluation have not yet been issued, and indicators and diagnosis techniques are needed to establish a "built-in" evaluation system. Wide-spread introduction of the performance monitoring system is to begin in 1981, with extensive in-service training. The intended participation of Member States, the Executive Board, and outside experts and organizations in UNESCO evaluation activities has not yet begun.

Some basic operating problems also exist. The great diversity of evaluation and assessment work in the various UNESCO programme sectors makes even inventory-taking difficult and there is still no agreement on which activities are in fact "evaluations". Evaluation resources are scattered: each sector has a Unit for Co-ordination and Evaluation but they are overloaded with other tasks, and several other evaluation specialists work in special programme areas. Much work is still needed to link existing reporting processes with evaluation to form a more streamlined and effective programming, reporting and management information system. As a result of the future plans and these present operating complications, the very small central evaluation unit will be severely pressed to "organize and systematize" evaluation work, particularly since UNESCO is decentralizing its operations to a more regional structure.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNESCO appears to be moving towards a comprehensive internal evaluation system. A solid conceptual foundation has been established and a logical sequence of further steps programmed, with strong General Conference and Executive Board support. The next few years will be critical, however, if the system is to be soundly established and implemented, and is to serve as an effective management tool and process to further enhance UNESCO operations. To realize the system's potential it is essential that the central evaluation unit be strengthened to perform its support, training and co-ordination functions, that its authority cover both regular and extra-budgetary programmes, that firm linkages with the programme sectors and decentralized regions be developed, and that the management information system be streamlined and integrated as part of the evaluation effort.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.k.

XIX. UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION (UPU)

Total expenditures: \$US 14,300,000 Total staff: 168
Evaluation unit: None
Year established: Not applicable Number of staff: Not applicable
Organizational location: Technical Co-operation Division
Evaluation approach: Technical co-operation evaluation procedures adapted from UNDP

UPU's evaluation activities are limited to its technical co-operation work, as in 1977. Any extension of evaluation appears to be linked to a change in its programming and budgeting arrangements.

UPU has four major components. The Universal Postal Congress usually meets every five years, and the Executive Council and a Consultative Council for Postal Studies meet annually. The International Bureau serves as the permanent secretariat, providing information and services for postal administrations and executing technical co-operation activities.

The possibilities for an internal evaluation system in UPU are constrained by the nature of its work programmes which are set by the quinquennial Congress sessions. The "work programmes" appear actually to be more lists of studies on various topics from much longer lists, to be carried out over the five-year period by the two Councils. In 1976 a more coherent programming system was proposed to the Executive Council, and it was decided to propose it to the 1979 Congress for study and then report to the 1984 Congress for decision. This study is about to be undertaken by the Executive Council. In the meantime, UPU is also moving to a self-financing system based on advance contributions by Member States, but is retaining its functional style budget for the time being. At present, UPU management analysis processes are modest and are concentrated on improving the efficiency of support services.

UPU's evaluation work is confined to the technical co-operation area, using methods drawn up by its Executive Council during 1971-73 which generally follow UNDP policies and procedures. Although officials felt that the UNDP management systems are somewhat cumbersome, UPU does apply the UNDP emphasis on project follow-up to ensure results of its own and UNDP-funded projects. It prepares reports assessing its technical co-operation results on a regular basis, and has also developed a process of operational team missions to, among other things, review the efficiency of regional postal programmes.

In comments on evaluation to the Executive Council in 1980, the Secretary-General observed that any expansion of the internal evaluation system beyond technical co-operation would first require careful study in cost benefit terms, bearing in mind the nature of UPU activities and resources available. Implementation would then have to be done selectively and on a trial basis.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UPU does not appear to need an internal evaluation system at present. However, it seems that the overall UPU programme of studies could benefit from a more orderly but not elaborate programming approach which would emphasize co-ordinated planning and appraisal of the relative costs and benefits of the studies, and more orderly analysis of their implementation and their results. In such a system, evaluation could play a useful role. UPU should consider the planning, programming, evaluation and reporting techniques developed by other UN system organizations for adaptation.

See recommendation in paragraph 7.j.

XX. WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (WFP)

Total expenditures: \$US 533,500,000 Total staff: 877
Evaluation unit: Evaluation Service
Year established: 1963 Number of staff: 10
Organizational location: Office of the Executive Director
Evaluation approach: Primarily interim and "in-depth" evaluations by
joint missions

WFP has one of the oldest evaluation units in the UN system, and it is also a relatively large one. However, this central unit shares many WFP management responsibilities, which hampers efforts to move in new directions.

WFP seeks to stimulate social and economic development through aid in the form of food, and also helps meet emergency food needs created by disasters. It is jointly sponsored by FAO and the United Nations, and oversight is provided by the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes (CFA), which meets twice a year.

An Evaluation Service was included at WFP's inception in 1963, and it appears to be a well-established, accepted and supported central unit. The Service is located in the Office of the Executive Director and has 10 professional staff plus consultant services. Interim or mid-term evaluations of larger, complex, or new-phase projects comprise most work (some 300 reports to date). Under the basic WFP evaluation approach (*), they are usually performed by joint missions, staffed by the Evaluation Service, WFP headquarters, and other UN system organizations, working closely with WFP field staff and government authorities. Reporting procedures are extensive, since a summary of each interim evaluation report is presented to the CFA. In addition, the Service has prepared about 350 project terminal reports drafted by field staff, and has added some sectoral evaluations as well.

In 1978 the CFA called for strengthened feedback of evaluation results to improve project formulation and implementation (*), including updated operational guidelines (*) and a general summary of lessons learned to be provided to the CFA every five years. Another recent development has been "in-depth" evaluations to study more carefully the economic, social and nutritional impact of major WFP projects. Six such studies, with a greater use of consultants, are now underway.

Further evaluation progress appears to require strengthening of other WFP management functions. Basic planning, programming and review activities seem at present to be spread rather uncertainly among the Office of Executive Director, Project Management Division, and Resources Management Division. Although the Evaluation Service is relatively large, its workload has been heavy because it carries a substantial share of WFP policy and planning, project reporting and data gathering, and field monitoring work through and in addition to its many evaluations, terminal reports, and field missions. The need to systematize WFP management processes is recognized by the Secretariat as well as the CFA, as in current efforts to develop a new computerized management information system. There has also been some discussion of whether WFP might eventually move towards "built-in" self-evaluation for its widespread field operations, or whether the existing centralized evaluation system is preferable.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: WFP's Evaluation Service is a very experienced one, but in recent years it has had to spread its basic evaluation and feedback functions more and more thinly over more complex project work, because it also carries a considerable part of the basic management process workload of the world-wide WFP operations. If WFP project planning, formulation, monitoring, reporting, and management information processes can be made more systematic, it appears that the Evaluation Service could in turn concentrate more fully on ensuring orderly and effective evaluation and feedback work.

(*) See bibliography

See recommendation in paragraph 7.1.

XXI. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)

Total expenditures: \$US 375,100,000 Total staff: 5,376
Evaluation unit: Development of Health Programme Evaluation
Year established: 1976 Number of staff: 1 in Headquarters
Organizational location: under Headquarters' Programme Committee
Evaluation approach: Built-in evaluation by countries and within WHO

WHO has moved forward steadily with its comprehensive efforts to help improve national health programmes and evaluation processes, and to further develop the parallel WHO processes as well.

The purpose of WHO is the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health. This has recently been refined to imply the attainment by all people by the year 2000 of a level of health that will permit them to lead a socially and economically productive life, popularly known as health for all by the year 2000(*). The World Health Assembly meets annually to decide on WHO policy and the Executive Board meets biannually. Each of the six regions has a regional committee of governmental representatives which meets annually, a regional office, and WHO Programme Co-ordinators working in Member States.

To facilitate health for all by the year 2000, WHO is supporting the formulation of national, regional and global strategies, which include monitoring and evaluation as an integral component (*). WHO seeks to support both evaluation activities at the country level and its own co-operative activities. The approach is one of in-built evaluation, with emphasis on the integration of the evaluation process within a broader managerial process for national health development and a similar process for WHO's programme development.

During the past few years WHO has promoted these management processes and has developed guiding principles for evaluation for national as well as WHO programmes (*). Internally, programme profiles serve as vehicles to transmit evaluation information to and from the various operational levels. Regional or national meetings, seminars and workshops have been held to promote programme evaluation efforts. New concise management development guidance is being prepared and the content of the Director-General's reports on WHO work has been improved (*). A list of health indicators has been developed to permit countries and WHO to better monitor and evaluate progress towards Health for All (*).

The WHO evaluation "unit" is a single officer responsible for the development of programme evaluation, as part of a small group for Managerial Processes for Programme Development which reports to the Headquarters Programme Committee. Responsibility for evaluation in WHO lies with programme managers at all operational levels with respect to the programmes with which they are concerned. The evaluation of the programme as a whole is undertaken by the regional committees, Executive Board, and World Health Assembly, following reviews by various Secretariat Committees composed of representatives of executive management.

The comprehensive, decentralized and flexible nature of the WHO system makes a precise assessment of current progress difficult. The headquarters group monitors overall progress in applying the evaluation process - as in several recent meetings to assess system experience (*) and through other follow-up and support activities. There are areas where, as could be expected, efforts are just beginning, have progressed slowly, or have proven difficult, but a considerable number of promising national and WHO planning, assessment, monitoring, design, training and reporting activities are established or underway. WHO officials recognize the challenging long-term process involved, but believe that it is the best way to build managerial self-reliance and improve health operations worldwide.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: In the past few years WHO has done much to establish its evaluation system, with strong governing body, top management and staff support. WHO realizes that substantial further development and improvement will be necessary, but the existing framework and approach hold considerable potential for better national health programme evaluation and for the WHO evaluation processes as well.

(*) See bibliography

XXII. WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO)

Total expenditures: \$US 31,500,000 Total staff: 388
Evaluation unit: Reports and Evaluation Branch
Year established: 1968 Number of staff: 2
Organizational location: Programme Planning and Co-ordination Division,
Technical Co-operation Department
Evaluation approach: UNDP evaluation procedures

WMO's evaluation activities have not changed much since 1977, with evaluation still largely confined to technical co-operation projects. However, WMO does have more extensive assessment and progress reporting activities than many other small UN system organizations.

WMO operates under a four-year programme and budget (currently 1980-83) and annual budgets. The World Meteorological Congress meets at least once every four years to establish the programme and budget for the subsequent four-year period and determine general policy. There are also six regional meteorological associations and eight technical commissions. The Executive Committee, which meets at least once a year, fixes the annual budget, supervises the programme, initiates studies and makes recommendations for international action.

WMO has no management or internal review officers, although the need for an internal auditor post has been and still is being discussed. However, other analytical and reporting processes exist. The Congress and Executive Committee usually make very specific reporting requests which the Secretariat fulfills. Each year WMO permanent representatives - usually the heads of national weather services - are sent a questionnaire and asked to carefully assess WMO and general meteorological operations in their country. Large programmes such as the Global Atmospheric Research Programme involve inter-governmental monitoring panels and specific follow-up on results achieved, and the World Weather Watch Programme is also closely monitored, analyzed and reported on annually. The annual report by the Secretary-General also focuses on the progress, status, activities and obligations of the various WMO programmes.

The Reports and Evaluation Branch of the Programme Planning and Co-ordination Division concentrates its work on assessment of technical co-operation projects which WMO executes for UNDP, with primary reliance on tripartite reviews, terminal reports, and project monitoring. There is also an established process for follow-up on the results of WMO fellowship programmes. WMO has done some work with UNDP and UNEP to improve planning, programming, monitoring and tripartite reviews and expects more such efforts in the future. In addition, an assessment of the effectiveness of the overall technical co-operation programme based on field assessments is made and reported to the Executive Committee annually, and each fourth year to the Congress, to allow them to review and adjust technical co-operation policies, objectives, arrangements and resources as necessary.

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Because of the variety of regular assessment and reporting activities already in place, WMO does not appear to need an elaborate internal evaluation system at present. Its analytical and management processes, however, could of course benefit from a continuing consideration of programming, evaluation and reporting approaches and techniques being developed by other organizations in the UN system.

See recommendation in paragraph 7.j.

XXIII. WORLD BANK

<u>Total expenditures:</u> \$US 276,600,000 (fiscal 1979)	<u>Total staff:</u> 5,200
<u>Evaluation unit:</u> Operations Evaluation Department	
<u>Year established:</u> 1970	<u>Number of staff</u> 27
<u>Organizational location:</u> under Executive Directors	
<u>Evaluation approach:</u> Built-in self-evaluation with central review, and central unit evaluations	

The World Bank has developed and applied some innovative approaches to systematic and participative evaluation, evaluation reporting, and work with developing country governments on evaluation.

The Bank Group is composed of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), and the International Finance Corporation (IFC). Their common objective is to raise standards of living in developing countries by channelling financial resources. Oversight is provided for the IBRD and IDA by a Board of Governors and 21 full-time Executive Directors, while IFC has a similar organizational structure. The Bank's internal evaluation system is supervised by the Director-General, Operations Evaluation, who reports to the Executive Directors, the Joint Audit Committee, and the President. The Operations Evaluation Department (OED), composed of Bank staff on rotating multi-year assignments and operating under systematic guidelines (*), assists him. The Bank also has other types of evaluation and review activity for economic and sector, programme and budgeting, policy and research, and training and organizational matters.

All completed Bank projects are reviewed under the project performance audit system (except for IFC, which has its own project supervision system). This system has two tiers: self-evaluation by the relevant operational units through Project Completion Reports, and independent reviews of these reports and of selected projects by OED staff. About half the 125-150 such OED reviews each year are brief, others intermediate, and one-quarter in-depth. Draft audit reports are sent to borrower governments and the responsible departments for comment, then finalized and released to the Executive Directors and the President. In addition, an annual summary of all the reports is prepared and published (*) to maintain a continuing overview of project experience, lessons learned from both successes and failures, and their implications. A computerized record of all findings is also maintained. The overall emphasis is on participative assessment and feedback of experience to reinforce the results orientation of Bank operations, and to inform Bank shareholders and management of findings and implications for current operations.

In addition to the some 550 performance audits done to date, OED staff also do 8-10 evaluation studies and operational policy reviews each year: the former identify programmatic patterns of project clusters to improve future design and implementation, while the latter focus on experience with policies and procedures to identify improvement possibilities. A new series has been initiated to visit projects a few years after completion to attempt to identify their wider direct and indirect impact. The Bank is working to strengthen systematically evaluation work by governments, not only through joint exercises on projects but for general evaluation functions as well, using on-the-job training and informal regional seminars. Monitoring and evaluation both at the project and the national levels have also been introduced in courses given by the Economic Development Institute. Finally, the OED reporting process includes an annual report on operations evaluation itself (*).

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The World Bank has a well-established and experienced operational evaluation system. While the Bank operates in a situation more directly oriented to large-scale development operations than most other UN system organizations, many of the concepts and practices underlying its evaluation experience appear useful and adaptable to other organizations in the system which are still developing their evaluation systems and evaluation reporting functions.

(*) See bibliography

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT DOCUMENTS

United Nations

"Programme Evaluation for the Period 1974-1977", including Annex, "Revised Guidelines for Internal Evaluation", ECOSOC document E/AC.51/91 of 16 May 1978.

"Report on Programming and Evaluation in the United Nations: Comments", General Assembly document A/33/226/Add.1 of 1 September 1978.

"Establishment of Internal Work Programmes and Procedures for Reporting on Programme Implementation", General Assembly document A/C.5/34/3 of 23 April 1979.

"The Identification of Output in the Programme Budget of the United Nations", General Assembly document A/C.5/35/2 of 13 March 1980.

"Programme Performance of the United Nations for the biennium 1978-1979", General Assembly document A/C.5/35/1 of 19 March 1980.

"Identification of Activities That have been Completed or are Obsolete, of Marginal Usefulness or Ineffective", A/C.5/34/4 of 15 August 1979 and A/C.5/35/40 and /Add.1 of 14 November 1980.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

"Assessment of Projects", UNICEF Field Manual, Vol. 1, Book A, Chapter 2 and Preface of July 1974.

"Criteria for Programme Appraisal, Monitoring and Evaluation", ECOSOC document E/ICEF/P/L.1628 of 19 January 1976.

"Problems of programming: Note and Recommendations by the Executive Director", ECOSOC document E/ICEF/L.1414 of 21 April 1980.

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) (UNCHS)

"UNCHS (Habitat) Project Management System", of 13 November 1980.

International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT (ITC)

"Enhancing the Effectiveness of Technical Assistance in Export Promotion: Proposals for a Project Evaluation System", ITC/AG(VIII)/40 of November 1974.

"Enhancing the Effectiveness of Technical Assistance in Export Promotion: Evaluation Arrangements for ITC Projects", ITC/OD/INF/135 of 5 April 1978.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

"Project Evaluation", Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 3470 of 1 December 1975.

"Joint UNDP/Agency Evaluation Programme", UNDP document DP/319/Add.1 of 5 April 1978.

"Report of the Administrator for 1978", especially section III.D. "Issues for the Future: More Effective Implementation", UNDP document DP/380 of 26 April 1979.

"Evaluation and Related Measures for Improving The Quality of Technical Co-operation", UNDP document DP/448 of 5 March 1980.

Evaluation Studies: No. 1, "Comprehensive Development Planning", June 1979; No. 2, "Rural Development", June 1979; No. 3, "Rural Women's Participation in Development", June 1980; No. 4, "Agricultural Training", 1980; and Studies No. 5 through 10, to be published in 1981.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

"Co-ordination Questions: System-wide Medium-Term Environment Programme", UNEP/GC.7/6 of 24 January 1979.

"Project and Programme Evaluation", UNEP/GC.7/13 of 25 January 1979.

"The Environment Fund: Report of the Executive Director", (Section III, Project Evaluation), UNEP/GC.8/7 of 20 February 1980.

United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)

"Evaluation of UNFPA Projects: Report of the Executive Director", UNDP documents DP/331 of 24 April 1978 and DP/493 of 15 April 1980.

"UNFPA Instructions for the Preparation of a Project Document", UNFPA/19/Rev. No.2 of 15 October 1978.

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

"Project Management System (PMS) Handbook", PCS/335, of May 1979.

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

"Progress Report on Systems Design for Internal Evaluation", UNIDO document ID/B/C.3/80 of 14 February 1979.

"Progress Report on System Design for Internal Evaluation and Other Activities", UNIDO document ID/B/C.3/89/Rev.1 of 19 March 1980.

Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

"Auto-Evaluation of the Regular Programme", Director-General's Bulletin No.78/23 of 5 May 1978.

"Review of the Regular Programme, 1978-1979", C 79/8 of July 1979.

"Review of Field Programmes, 1978-1979", C 79/4 of September 1979.

"Auto-Evaluation: Note on Implementation", Evaluation Service, November 1979.

"Evaluation of Technical Cooperation Projects: Guidelines", Evaluation Service, 1979.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

"Lending Policies and Criteria", IFAD/8/Rev.1, December 1978.

"Operational Guidelines on Monitoring and Evaluation", December 1979.

International Labour Organisation (ILO)

"Procedures for the Design and Evaluation of ILO Projects", Vol.I "General" of January 1979; Vol. II "Technical Co-operation" of June 1979 (being revised early 1981); Vol. III "Research" (early 1981).

"ILO Technical Co-operation Activities 1979-80, Including Tripartite Participation," ILO document GB.214/OP/1/3 of November 1980.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

"Preliminary Report of the Director-General on Studies Carried Out Concerning Evaluation of Programme Activities", documents 103 EX/10 of 11 August 1977, and Executive Board 104 EX/Decision 4.3.

"Evaluation Terms: UNESCO Glossary", document BEP-79/WS/8 of 23 July 1979.

"Draft Programme and Budget for 1981-1983", General Conference, Twenty-first Session, Belgrade 1980, 21 C/5, paragraphs 244-253.

"Report of the Director-General on Studies Undertaken, Measures Adopted and Results Obtained in Evaluation of the Programme" (Part I); "Statement of Major Impacts, Achievements, Difficulties and Shortfalls for Each Continuing Activity in 1979-1980" (Part II), General Conference, Twenty-first Session, Belgrade 1980, 21 C/11, of 23 August 1980.

World Food Programme (WFP)

"The Approach to Evaluation of WFP Development Aid", WFP/IGC: 25/12 of February 1974, and Add. 1 through 5.

"Informal Working Group on Evaluation: Feedback of Evaluation into Project Formulation and Implementation", WFP/IWGE of March 1978.

"Evaluation", WFP Field Manual, Chapter XV of 1 January 1980.

World Health Organization (WHO)

"Provisional Guidelines for Health Programme Evaluation", WHO document HPC/DPE/78.1, 1978.

"Development of Health Programme Evaluation", WHA resolution 31.11 of 18 May 1978.

"Managerial Process for Health Development", WHA resolution 31.43 of 24 May 1978.

"Primary Health Care", Report of the International Conference on Primary Health Care, Alma Ata, 1978, WHO, Geneva 1978.

"Formulating Strategies for Health for All by the Year 2000: Guiding Principles and Essential Issues", WHO document of the Executive Board, 1979.

"Applying Health Programme Evaluation: Assessment and Recommendations", WHO document DPE/80/1.

"Indicators for Monitoring Progress Towards Health for All by the Year 2000", WHO document EB67/13 Add. 1, 1980.

"The Work of WHO 1978-1979: Biennial Report of the Director-General", WHO document, 1980.

World Bank

"Operational Evaluation: World Bank Standards and Procedures", Second Edition, August 1979.

"Sixth Annual Review of Project Performance Audit Results", September 1980.

"Annual Report on Operations Evaluation", August 1980.

Joint Inspection Unit (JIU)

"Report on Evaluation in the United Nations System", JIU/REP/77/1 of March 1977.

"Report on Programming and Evaluation in the United Nations", JIU/REP/78/1 of March 1978.

"Glossary of Evaluation Terms", JIU/REP/78/5 of November 1978.

"Initial Guidelines for Internal Evaluation Systems of United Nations Organizations", JIU/REP/79/2 of February 1979.

"UNICEF: Planning and Programming for Children at the Country Level", JIU/REP/80/3 of March 1980.

SECOND REPORT ON
EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEMPrepared by Earl D. Sohm
Joint Inspection Unit

SUMMARY

A 1977 JIU report on evaluation in the United Nations system found that interest was at a "take-off point". This 1981 status report indicates that evaluation activities exist in the system on a wider scale than ever before. Considerable progress has been made, but much remains to be done to ensure that the new or improved internal evaluation systems are firmly established, and will actually be used to carefully assess results and improve programmes.

The number of organizations with evaluation systems has more than doubled from those surveyed in 1977. Chapter II discusses the strong trend toward built-in self-evaluation as the basic approach because of its broad coverage, quick feedback and low cost. However, most organizations have central evaluation units so small (2 officers or less) that system implementation is jeopardized.

Chapter III discusses the importance of integrating evaluation with organizational decision-making processes in an overall management development effort. Evaluation has already proven useful in improving project and programme design, but linkages with other phases of the management cycle are not yet firm.

Agreement is emerging that evaluation methodology must adapt to specific organizational situations and focus pragmatically on simple and effective formats. But Chapter IV notes that methodologies are not yet well developed beyond the project level, and there are still strong temptations to mis-label more casual reviews as "evaluations".

Most systems are just now reaching the evaluation feedback and reporting stages discussed in Chapter V. Systematic internal feedback processes, evaluation "memory banks", and follow-up procedures are needed. Initial reports to governing bodies have been well received, and it appears that good evaluation reporting can help simplify overall performance reporting.

Chapter VI reviews the strong interest in increased work with governments to improve their own evaluation activities, which JIU will study separately in 1981. After a lengthy review and inter-agency consultation process, UNDP is also ready to revise and strengthen its field project monitoring and evaluation system.

Support for evaluation has increased through greater understanding and initial positive use of evaluation findings, as noted in Chapter VII, but overall support is still fragile. Evaluation systems must be clearly established and a firm commitment made by governing bodies, top management and staff to steadily improve evaluation quality.

Chapter VIII concludes that internal evaluation systems have passed with general success through the first critical stage of introduction and development, but are now entering a second critical stage of widespread implementation. The present challenge is for organizations to strengthen and use these systems effectively. While evaluation system development will continue to be gradual, the next few years will be very important in establishing the value of evaluation in the United Nations system. The Inspector recommends that the organizations consider

- the merits of a built-in self-evaluation approach,
- sufficient evaluation staffing to meet expanded system implementation needs,
- evaluation system coverage and development plans, guidelines on integrated management system relationships and development, and basic evaluation standards,
- specific evaluation analysis, follow-up and reporting mechanisms and procedures,
- present and future actions to assist developing country evaluation activities,
- (UNDP) action to implement a revised project evaluation system,
- effective training programmes to support evaluation system development.

Another report (JIU/REP/81/5) summarizes internal evaluation status in 23 United Nations system organizations, and includes recommendations for some of them.

