

# Regional Workshop on the UNDP Evaluation Policy

## Africa

28 Nov – 1 Dec, 2006  
Johannesburg, South Africa

### WORKSHOP REPORT

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME EVALUATION OFFICE



January, 2007

## 1.0 Summary and Recommendations

The Africa workshop on the UNDP evaluation policy was the second in a series of regional workshops to launch the policy and discuss its implications for implementation at country and corporate levels. Held over three and a-half days in Johannesburg, South Africa, between 28<sup>th</sup> November and 1<sup>st</sup> December 2006, the workshop addressed the role of evaluation and the function of the policy in the context of Africa's regional and national development priorities. Over 100 delegates from 35 UNDP Country Offices, 28 governments, other UN agencies and UNDP headquarter bureaux and units attended. His Excellency, Ambassador Grey Johnson of the Gambia to the UN, represented the Executive Board in his capacity as the Vice Chair of the Africa Group. Mr. Gilbert Hounbo, Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa was present at the closing session of the workshop to respond to issues raised and recommendations made by the country teams.

Over the past decades, Africa has had declining trends in development indicators. The region's prospect of attaining the MDGs is generally low and levels of poverty and inequality have been rising at an alarming rate. Within this context, the workshop highlighted the missed opportunities for evaluation in Africa. It was acknowledged that evaluation should have played a more prominent role in providing the requisite knowledge to support development effectiveness. Evaluation should be used for learning to avoid past mistakes and failures in development interventions, but it was found that this has not always been the case. Evaluation was, however, found to have been tied to grants and official development assistance (ODA) from donor agencies, thus emphasizing particularly accountabilities and the performance of aid. While the coherence of aid efforts may have been enhanced through aid instruments such as Direct Budget Support (DBS) and Sector Wide Approaches (SWAPs), the weak national ownership of the evaluation function was found to have limited the value of these modalities for overall development effectiveness.

A number of positive trends in capacity development and national ownership signal the enhancement of an evaluation culture in Africa. These include the democratization of evaluation and its use as a tool for governance by the public in assessing public policies; the strengthening of national evaluation systems and services by linking them more closely to policy processes; and the growth of regional and national evaluation associations and universities in building the cadre and network of professional evaluators.

The UNDP evaluation policy challenges the organization to increase the national ownership of evaluation through a better alignment of UNDP activities with national plans and systems and in supporting national capacity development. To do so, it was recognized that UNDP would have to adapt existing institutional arrangements, fill gaps in resources and staff capacity, and harmonize with other UN agencies. In supporting the emerging demands in the national evaluation systems, it was recommended that UNDP should play a major role in developing a programmatic focus on advocating for evaluation, developing expertise, coordinating partnerships and donor efforts in evaluation, and supporting institutional capacity development.

The following key recommendations were made during the workshop:

*To the Regional Bureau for Africa and Regional Service Centre in Johannesburg:*

- Create the position of Evaluation Advisor in the Regional Service Centre to enhance the evaluability of programmes and quality of evaluations.

- Develop a clear accountability mechanism to hold Country Office senior management (Resident Representatives and Deputy Resident Representatives-Programme) accountable for the implementation of the evaluation policy.
- Make systematic and strategic use of evaluation data in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) in exercising the oversight function.
- Review the M&E capacity of the Country Offices in light of the new strategy for UNDP in Africa and provide necessary technical and financial resources to carry out the evaluation function.
- Develop a regional programme to support Evaluation Capacity Development for government and national counterparts in the region.

*To the Evaluation Office:*

- Ensure timely translation of resource materials, guidelines and corporate evaluation reports into French as the majority of existing resources are only available in English.
- Work with the Learning Resource Centre of the Office of Human Resources to develop an on-line training course in evaluation with certification for staff and national partners.
- In collaboration with regional and national evaluation associations, identify African evaluators and evaluators in Africa who can support the new generation of evaluations and invite them to join the Evaluation Office vetted Expert Roster.
- In collaboration with the UN Evaluation Group and UN Development Group, improve guidelines on developing an UNDAF M&E framework and provide technical guidance and develop clear guidelines on joint evaluations.
- Work with the Executive Office, practice and policy bureaux and RBA to clarify the roles and responsibilities of their support and oversight functions to ensure effective implementation of the Evaluation Policy at the country level.
- Whenever possible and relevant, provide technical referral or guidance on evaluation matters including evaluation capacity development.
- Provide specific guidelines on mainstreaming gender and human rights in evaluation in the new M&E Handbook.

*To other Headquarters Bureaux and units:*

- Strengthen ATLAS to support results-based monitoring at the country level (Bureau of Management and Operations Support Group with Evaluation Office).

*To Country Offices working together with Government:*

- Sensitize country office senior management, colleagues and national counterparts to the evaluation policy.
- Ensure broader involvement and ownership of evaluation throughout the evaluation process, including the development of an evaluation plan, the design of TOR, the selection of evaluation consultants, the review of evaluation reports and preparation of a management response to evaluation findings and recommendations.
- Develop and enhance partnerships with universities and national/regional evaluation associations for their role in enhancing technical expertise and in knowledge generation.
- Strengthen in-house capacity and systems by ensuring appropriate institutional arrangements that will meet the needs of the monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management functions of Country Offices. At least, one staff member should be dedicated to M&E activities in the office.
- Allocate adequate funds to support the implementation of the evaluation plans.

- Enhance the dissemination process by consistently making evaluation findings available in local languages and involving parliament and media in the dissemination process of evaluation findings.
- Make active use of UNDP tools such as EvalNet and the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) to contribute to global knowledge generation and learning.

*Please see the workshop website for further details:*

[http://stone.undp.org/undpweb/eo/evalnet/workshop/policy\\_launch/africa.cfm](http://stone.undp.org/undpweb/eo/evalnet/workshop/policy_launch/africa.cfm)

## **2.0. Introduction**

In June 2006, the Executive Board endorsed the Evaluation Policy for UNDP. The policy reaffirms the central tenets of evaluation in UNDP, the guiding principles and norms, the requirements, and the roles and responsibilities at all levels of the organization.

To launch the implementation of the policy, and discuss its implications with national counterparts, a series of regional workshops has been planned by the Evaluation Office in collaboration with the Regional Bureaux. The workshops were intended for UNDP Country Offices and national government staff responsible for planning or making decisions on evaluation. The first such workshop focused on the Asia-Pacific region, and was held in Bangkok in mid-October, 2006. The second workshop, focusing on the Africa region took place in Johannesburg, South Africa from 28<sup>th</sup> November to 1<sup>st</sup> December 2006, and will be followed by others in Europe CIS, Latin America and Arab States regions.

### **2.1 Objectives of the Workshop**

The objective of the workshop was to establish a rational basis for implementing the policy in the context of regional and national priorities and challenges by:

1. Developing a comprehensive understanding of the UNDP evaluation policy and its implications for implementation.
2. Enhancing understanding of how the UNDP evaluation function provides a basis for accountability, performance improvement, learning, and knowledge development.
3. Developing an effective and rational approach in carrying out roles and responsibilities in evaluation in partnership with government and other key stakeholders.

The workshop also addressed a number of cross-cutting issues including: the alignment of the policy with national evaluation systems and institutions, ways of enhancing collaboration in evaluation with national partners, and meeting the requirements of UN reform for coherence and harmonization. It also addressed evaluation in areas of increasing importance such as UNDP's support and contribution in conflict-affected countries, and in the HIV/AIDS response.

### **2.2 Participation**

The workshop was attended by over one hundred delegates including representatives from thirty-five UNDP Country Office and twenty-eight governments. There were also representatives from UNIFEM, UNICEF, UNCDF, Regional Service Centre in Johannesburg, the Regional Bureau for Africa, the Office of Audit and Performance Review, and Evaluation Office (see Annex 2 for the participants list). His Excellency, Ambassador Grey Johnson of the Gambia to the UN, represented the Executive Board in his capacity as the Vice Chair of the Africa Group. Mr. Gilbert Hougbo, Director of the Regional Bureau for Africa attended the closing session of the workshop to respond to issues raised and recommendations made by the country teams.

### **2.3 Overview of sessions**

The workshop was divided into six sessions running over three and a-half days (see Annex 1 for the full agenda.). These sessions were delivered via plenary presentations and discussions, country case presentations, group analyses, and practical exercises.

The first session, *Regional Development Priorities and Evaluation*, set the context of evaluation by addressing key development issues in the region, and challenges and recommendations for the role of evaluation in development.

The second session, *Monitoring and Evaluation in the National Context*, provided an opportunity for governments, civil society, associations and academia to present self-directed solutions, approaches and systems in addressing regional and national challenges and in contributing to accountability, learning and improvement across the board at the national level.

The third session, *UNDP Evaluation Policy and its Implications for the way UNDP Works*, sought to establish a clear understanding of UNDP Evaluation Policy. It highlighted key parameters of the policy, roles and responsibilities for evaluation across the organization, and the existing support systems and mechanisms at the corporate level to support the implementation of the policy at the country level.

The fourth session, *UN Reform and Evaluation*, engaged the participants in a discussion of the implications of UN reform for evaluation and on the key issues and challenges in evaluation in the context of the UN reform agenda.

The fifth session, *Thematic Issues and Approaches in Evaluation*, presented two independent evaluations *UNDP's assistance to conflict-affected countries* and *UNDP's role and contribution in the HIV/AIDS response in Southern Africa and Ethiopia*. The session highlighted methodological challenges and advances for evaluations in the areas noted.

The final session, *The Way Forward*, provided an opportunity for UNDP staff and government counterparts to identify measures and actions to be carried out in their particular situation in implementing the policy.

## **2.4 Evaluation of the Workshop by the Participants**

UNDP staff and government counterparts assessed the success of the workshop on two criteria: 1) the degree to which the various sessions helped them achieve the workshop objectives; and 2) the level of usefulness of the structure and delivery of the workshop in achieving the objectives of the workshop. Sixty-six (66) of the eight-four (84) staff and government participants completed the workshop evaluation questionnaire providing a response rate of 79 %.

- Eighty percent (80%) of the respondents rated the workshop as having been largely or completely successful in achieving its objectives.
- The session on the UNDP evaluation policy was considered the most useful (89%).
- The session on Monitoring and Evaluation in the National Context was considered the least useful (74%).
- The modalities of the workshop were also well received, with 86% of participants indicating that the way in which the workshop was delivered was largely or completely useful in helping achieve the workshop objectives.
- Reporting in plenary on group work and discussions of this work was regarded particularly useful (89%) as it facilitated cross-group learning and knowledge sharing.
- Small group work was also positively received although it was noted that more time should have been given for this.

Qualitative responses on the questionnaire recognized the importance of the strong and active participation of national government representatives, providing lively and open discussion and

exchange. The majority of issues covered were considered useful for implementing the policy at the national level. It was however noted that some sessions were too content-loaded. It was suggested that future workshops should last for one week to allow sufficient time to enhance depth of coverage of significant content.

Feedback on mixing Francophone and Anglophone participants in the same group varied. Some thought it was useful for cross sub-regional knowledge sharing, while others thought it caused delays due to translation inefficiencies. Some participants suggested keeping the number of participants small by holding two workshops; one for English speaking and other for French speaking. On the other hand, others appreciated the inclusive approach of covering the entire region, regardless of language requirements as it fostered cross-learning, knowledge sharing and building a comprehensive community of evaluation practices in the region as a whole.

Annex 3 provides further breakdown on the findings of the workshop evaluation.

### **3.0 Implementing the Policy – Issues and Recommendations of the Workshop**

The following section summarizes the key issues, their implications, and the recommended actions made during the workshop, drawing on case examples. Where appropriate, this is prefaced by relevant sections from the evaluation policy. Recommended actions are supported by an indication of who may act upon the recommendation. A full set of presentations made in each session of the workshop can be downloaded from the [workshop website](#).

#### **3.1 National Ownership of Evaluation**

##### *Relevant sections of the Evaluation Policy*

Evaluation should be guided by national priorities and concerns. It should be inclusive and take into account diverse national interests and values. Evaluation should strengthen partnerships with governments and key stakeholders. It should build the capacity of national institutions to implement, monitor and evaluate.

Senior management of Country Offices, regional bureaux, practice and policy bureaux and the associated funds and programmes will identify, with partner governments and key stakeholders, priority areas for evaluation when preparing the programme, and designing and implementing a strategic evaluation plan.

##### *Key issues and implications*

Discussions showed that evaluations at the national level have been largely driven by donor demands, skewing accountability away from the public. Despite emerging African-led initiatives such as the NEPAD Peer Review, systematic and democratic mechanisms for accountability of public policy at the national level continue to be absent or weak, resulting in a weak demand for evaluation. Greater ownership can be ensured by making evaluation more relevant to public interests and needs. The example of the civil society monitoring initiative in Ghana demonstrated the emerging role of monitoring as a basis for civil society to present its views on public policy outcomes.

Due to the general lack of participation of government in the UNDP evaluation commissioning process, the level of national ownership has been weak. Governments and the public have rarely been involved in the strategic selection of evaluation topics and design of evaluations, resulting in

the low utility and use of evaluations outside of the organization. This reduces their value in understanding development effectiveness, and in the transparency and thus accountability of its actions. The participants attributed this to the weak evaluation culture at all levels and reinforced the need to raise awareness of the role of evaluation and the benefits it brings to Africa. There is also need to ensure political buy-in and leadership in evaluation. The example of the South Africa country-led evaluation, which is currently being undertaken by UNEG in collaboration with the government of South Africa, showcased the high level of government ownership and leadership in evaluation. This approach promises to address the weaknesses of past practices in commissioning evaluations in UNDP.

### Recommended actions

- Work with national evaluation associations, universities and research institutions to enhance the culture of evaluation and promote evaluation for development effectiveness (see also section on partnership) (Country Offices working with Government, Regional Service Centre, Evaluation Office).
- Ensure broader involvement and ownership of evaluation throughout the evaluation process, including the development of an evaluation plan, the design of TOR, the selection of evaluation consultants, the review of evaluation reports and preparation of a management response to evaluation findings and recommendations (Country Offices working with Government).
- Prepare evaluation plans at the outset of the programme (global, regional, and country) and include them in the programme documents submitted to the Executive Board. Review evaluation plans (and results) annually as part of programme reviews (Global Programme, Regional Programme, and Country Offices).

## **3.2 Partnerships**

### Relevant sections of the Evaluation Policy

Success in carrying out development evaluation requires partnerships in evaluation, with national and international actors. UNDP will promote joint and country-led evaluations to respond to the expanding sectoral and programmatic nature of development cooperation.

Country offices should nurture a collaborative relationship with national evaluation institutions and associations. Such partnerships enhance the relevance, quality and utility of UNDP evaluation and its contribution to development, and can help build national capacity for evaluation.

### Key issues and implications

Presentations by the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA) highlighted successful cases of partnership in promoting a culture of evaluation, building capacity and enhancing the technical rigour of evaluation at the national and regional levels. However, the presentation by the University of Nairobi illustrated missed opportunities in forging partnership and drawing from existing expertise in strengthening the national evaluation function. The participants noted that it was often due to the lack of, or poor understanding of, public accountability and the role and positioning of the non-governmental actors in the national M&E systems. Generally, the value of M&E has not been regarded as a public good, and private institutions have not been regarded as

key constituents of the national M&E system. This poses a challenge to the private institutions' long-term sustainability and partnership with government.

Furthermore, it was noted that joint evaluations provide opportunities for national ownership and leaderships in evaluation. However, they have been scarce since they pose many challenges in the absence of clearly defined operational guidelines and methods.

#### Recommended actions

- Strengthen partnership with national evaluation associations and universities and draw from their expertise in an effort to enhance the quality of evaluations. As part of UNDP's on-going support to national M&E systems, provide them with financial and technical assistance (where relevant) to ensure their sustainability and effective contributions to the national M&E priorities (Country Offices working with Government, Regional Bureau, Regional Service Centre, Evaluation Office).
- Develop joint evaluation guidelines, with clear guidance on different financing options, roles and responsibilities, sample TORs and methods (Evaluation Office and UN Evaluation Group).

### **3.3 Evaluation for Management of Results**

#### Relevant section of the Evaluation Policy

Senior management of Country Offices, regional bureaux, practice and policy bureaux and the associated funds and programmes will ensure the evaluability of programmes by identifying clear results, developing measurable indicators, and establishing performance targets and baseline information. In collaboration with national stakeholders and partners, [they will] ensure the effective monitoring of implementation and performance of programmes to generate relevant, timely information for management for results and evaluation.

#### Key issues and implications

Strong monitoring systems are a prerequisite for successful evaluations, as was illustrated by the presentation from the Indonesia Country Office. However, many Country Offices in the region do not have a dedicated M&E unit or officer to support M&E activities across the UNDP programme portfolio. Indicators have not always been defined at the programme design stage. Baseline data has often been absent. The Somalia Country Office experience indicated that M&E was often seen as a costly exercise driven by external/donor demand. Although the introduction of Prince 2 and the certification of programme officers raised the profile of planning and monitoring, more efforts need to be made to raise the awareness of the value of improved planning and M&E for better management for results.

The participants expressed concerns that ATLAS in its current form was insufficiently equipped to ensure good substantive monitoring. Some Country Offices have addressed this issue by developing their own performance monitoring systems. It was noted that necessary measures should be in place to facilitate monitoring efforts of Country Offices and mitigate the risk of creating multiple information management systems. The participants also emphasized the importance of making substantive monitoring data available to government counterparts through

ATLAS. This would enhance the transparency and ownership of monitoring, as well as evaluation activities.

UNEG's presentation illustrated that the evaluability of United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) was an issue. In a number of instances, the UNDAF was developed in the absence of a well-constructed results framework and there were no clear guidelines on how to develop UNDAF M&E plans. Furthermore, support from HQ has been inadequate, and it was not clear who in the organization would be responsible for providing such support and guidance.

#### Recommended actions

- Ensure the development of robust results frameworks with clearly defined targets and indicators, and making baseline data available at the outset of the CPD/CPAP design (Country Offices with Government).
- Create the position of Evaluation Advisor in the Regional Service Centre to establish regional capacity in M&E to backstop Country Offices on technical issues (e.g. indicator selection and formulation, templates for monitoring systems etc.) (Regional Bureau).
- Enhance quality controls to ensure that indicators and CO monitoring systems in general meet minimum quality standards (Regional Bureau).
- Strengthen ATLAS to better support effective monitoring (Bureau of Management with Evaluation Office).
- Improve guidelines on developing an M&E framework of the UNDAF (United Nations Development Group and United Nations Evaluation Group).

### **3.4 Gender and human rights**

Evaluation is guided by the people-centred approach of UNDP to development, which enhances capabilities, choices and rights for all men and women. Evaluation abides by universally shared values of equity, justice, gender equality and respect for diversity.

#### Key issues and implications

Presentations by UNIFEM and the Africa Gender in Development Evaluation Network (AGDEN) highlighted the importance of conducting evaluations in UNDP from a human rights and human development perspective and taking into consideration the universally shared values, one of which is gender equality. Generally limited skills among UNDP programme officers to mainstream gender and human rights in programming and the absence of gender disaggregated data were seen as major impediments in the application of human rights principles to Evaluation. Furthermore, existing tools and guidelines in UNDP were found to have been insufficient to ensure the systematic application of human-rights and gender principles.

#### Recommended actions

- Provide specific guidelines on mainstreaming gender and human rights in evaluation in the new M&E Handbook. (Evaluation Office).
- Mainstream gender and human rights at the programme design stage by developing clear gender responsive baseline data and indicators (Country Offices with Government).

### **3.5 Institutional Arrangements**

#### *Relevant section of the Evaluation Policy*

Senior management of Country Offices, regional bureaux, practice and policy bureaux and the associated funds and programmes will establish an appropriate institutional arrangement to manage evaluation.

#### *Key issues and implications*

Existing institutional arrangements for M&E vary considerably from country to country. The work of M&E officers in some Country Offices has been limited to a specific trust fund or a project/programme. Ensuring coordination among different M&E frameworks and systems within the UNDP programme portfolio was thus recognized as a challenge.

While most Country Offices have an M&E focal point, the role played by the focal point and the capabilities of such persons have constrained the production of quality in evaluations. In the majority of cases, the roles and responsibilities of the M&E focal point have not been clearly understood. It was noted that having a dedicated unit or officer for the Country Office would enhance coordination and harmonization among various on-going M&E initiatives. An example from Somalia indicated that having a dedicated M&E officer enhances planning and M&E within the Country Office. The findings of the Office of Audit and Performance Review (OAPR) also confirmed that the presence of an M&E specialist in the office contributes to the timely preparation and revision of evaluation plan to ensure its relevance and utility. As demonstrated in the Indonesia Country Office example, while full monitoring and evaluation units at the Country Office level are ideal, it was considered that only few larger offices can afford to have such a unit.

It was argued that when the unit or a dedicated officer reports to CO management, it was not clear how the independence of evaluation could be assured. To assure independence of evaluation, it is important for the Country Office senior management to be aware of the independent nature of evaluation while providing adequate support to the function of such unit or officer.

It was noted that having an M&E focal point in Government working closely with the Country Office M&E focal point would enhance the national ownership of the M&E process, and the quality of data through enhanced transparency and the use of evaluative evidence in programmatic interventions.

The participants argued that monitoring should not be regarded as the only responsibility of an M&E focal point or M&E officer. In order to ensure sustainable and robust monitoring activities in Country offices and regardless of the varying institutional arrangements across the COs, the monitoring responsibility should be mainstreamed in the day-to-day work of UNDP programme officers.

#### *Recommended actions*

- For large Country Offices; review the establishment of monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management units. The Indonesia CO provides a strong case example.
- For small Country Offices; ensure that at least one person has the explicit task of being responsible for evaluations, providing technical backstopping and a quality control function for evaluations. For smaller offices, creating a position of a dedicated M&E professional at

the UN level (e.g. based in the RC office cost-shared by UNCT members) should be considered.

- Mainstream monitoring responsibility in the day-to-day work of programme officers. This should be a core task of a staff member and should be reflected in his/her TORs and Results and Competency Assessment (RCA) process (Country Offices).
- Establish evaluation focal points within national M&E systems to enhance the alignment of the UNDP M&E work with the national system and improve the opportunities for mutual learning and knowledge sharing (Country Offices with government).

### **3.6 Resources**

#### *Relevant section of the Evaluation Policy*

Senior management of Country Offices, regional bureaux, practice and policy bureaux and the associated funds and programmes will ensure adequate resources for evaluation. Country Offices, regional bureaux, and practice and policy bureaux will be required to prepare an evaluation plan, cost this plan, and allocate the requisite funds from appropriate project and programme budgets.

#### *Key issues and implications*

Existing budget practices for evaluation vary among Country Offices. Although an uncommon practice, some Country Offices allocate a percentage of a project/programme budget to evaluations during project design. Even when done, the amounts allocated generally have not been sufficient to carry out quality evaluations. The importance of defining resource requirements and identifying sources of funding while developing the evaluation plan was emphasized.

For outcome evaluations, one approach has been earmarking the project funds or drawing from a central resource pool. It was also suggested that, wherever possible, opportunities should be sought to cost-share evaluation with government, other UN agencies and donors. In particular this option should be explored when evaluating the contributions of common outcomes, as in the UNDAF.

#### *Recommended actions*

- Ensure that consistent planning for evaluations and earmarking funds as standard practice in line with the Evaluation Policy (Country Offices).
- Whenever relevant and possible, explore cost-sharing opportunities for outcome evaluations with government and other partners associated with the result being evaluated (Country Offices).
- Explore opportunities for providing UNDP Country Offices with resources to enhance the evaluation function and the quality of evaluation (Regional Bureau for Africa).

### **3.7 Capacity development**

The issues raised apply to capacity development with UNDP and for national systems, as follows.

## *1) Capacity in UNDP Country Offices*

### *Relevant sections of the Evaluation Policy*

Directors of Regional Bureaux, in their exercise of line oversight should support and guide Country Office capacity in evaluation, including establishing regional expertise and evaluation support systems. Country Offices, regional bureaux and practice and policy bureaux require technical and managerial expertise for commissioning and using evaluation for their programmes.

### *Key issues and implications*

The capacity to conduct effective monitoring and evaluation within Country Offices has generally been weak, and needs to be strengthened across the organization. While the need to build the capacity of M&E focal points in Country Offices was acknowledged, this was also seen as a priority for all programme staff. Francophone participants indicated that the absence of training and resources materials in French often limited their opportunities for learning.

It was also agreed that the variability in the conduct, quality and use of evaluations by UNDP was related more to a lack of culture of evaluation – recognizing the value of strong evaluation for performance improvement and learning – than the lack of capacity to do it (see section on Evaluation for Management of Results).

### *Recommended actions*

- Develop on-line evaluation training modules to strengthen the in-house capacity and systems on monitoring and evaluation (Evaluation Office and Learning Resource Centre).
- Through ERC, EvalNet and other tools, continue providing a forum for sharing experiences and knowledge in evaluation and good practices across the organization (Evaluation Office).
- Ensure timely translation of resource materials, guidelines and corporate evaluation reports into French (Evaluation Office).

## *2) National evaluation capacity*

### *Relevant sections of the Evaluation Policy*

Evaluation should strengthen partnerships with governments and key stakeholders. It should build the capacity of national institutions to implement, monitor and evaluate.

### *Key issues and implications*

There is a growing demand for UNDP to build national capacity for monitoring and evaluation. In particular, modalities such as DBS and SWAPs are found to place greater technical demands on UNDP Country Offices to build national capacities at the central and decentralized levels. This demand has been met by a number of Country Offices, including Tanzania, Malawi and Niger through support to the national M&E systems. However, it was noted that in some instances the government capacity surpasses that of UNDP Country Offices, limiting the ability of UNDP to meet emerging demands.

Further, the government counterparts noted that due to growing interests among development partners to support the national M&E capacity development, coordinating various efforts in this area has been challenging. In view of its mandate and comparative advantage, providing the coordination support in the area of M&E capacity development may be a niche for UNDP.

The upstream shift in evaluation towards evaluating outcomes and the contribution to development effectiveness was also found to require a different set of skills among evaluators. The supply of such evaluators seems to be insufficient, given the existing demand in the region.

#### Recommended actions

- Provide support in enhancing coordination with other development partners in M&E (Country Office).
- Make evaluation capacity development (ECD) a core element of UNDP's capacity development efforts (Country Offices, Regional Bureau, Bureau for Development Policy, and Evaluation Office).
- Conduct a diagnostic study of national M&E systems in new aid modalities and define the niche for UNDP to provide capacity development support. This requires a development of methodologies and approaches to meet the emerging demands (Bureau for Development Policy, Regional Bureau and Country Offices).
- Develop a regional programme to support Evaluation Capacity Development for government and national counterparts in the region (Regional Bureau for Africa).
- Whenever possible and relevant, provide technical referral or guidance on evaluation matters including evaluation capacity development (Evaluation Office).
- Work with regional/national evaluation associations and academic institutions to develop required skill sets among evaluators in Africa to conduct outcome evaluations (Evaluation Office).

### **3.8 Quality Enhancement and Assurance**

#### Relevant sections of the Evaluation Policy

All evaluations should meet minimum quality standards defined by the Evaluation Office. To ensure that the information generated is accurate and reliable, evaluation design, data collection and analysis should reflect professional standards, with due regard for any special circumstances or limitations reflecting the context of the evaluation. To ensure this, the professionalism of evaluators and their intellectual integrity in applying standard evaluation methods is critical.

The Evaluation Office is responsible for setting evaluation standards, developing and disseminating methodology and establishing the institutional mechanisms for applying the standards; and for assuring (the quality of) mandatory decentralized evaluations and support the quality assurance of the evaluations conducted by the associated funds and programmes.

#### Key issues and implications

Many participants were not aware of existing norms and standards, such as the UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards for evaluation in the UN system and the Africa Evaluation

Guidelines by AfrEA. Consequently, they have not been consistently applied and used across UNDP evaluation and with its partners. The emergence of new standards being developed by various countries and national evaluation associations pose challenges in ensuring synergy and complementarities with others.

The quality of evaluations was often found to be poor. In particular, it was noted that outcome evaluations fail to answer pertinent questions, lack a rigorous assessment of the contribution to the outcome(s) in question. Their credibility has suffered from a lack of reliable data emanating from regular monitoring. It was felt that more time and resources should be invested in planning and managing outcome evaluations, including the selection of outcome evaluators. Evaluators from the country and the region should be given priority in line with efforts to build national evaluation capacity (see section on Capacity Development).

The respective roles of Headquarters units and the Regional Centres in supporting Country Offices were not always clear. Whilst several units seemed to have some sort of role particularly for UNDAF evaluations, the division of responsibility and the clarity in terms of whom Country Offices should communicate with were not always clear.

#### Recommended actions

- Make better use of the evaluation standards through provision of appropriate guidance and establishment of quality assurance system. This is already underway with guidelines and quality criteria developed by the Evaluation Office (Evaluation Office, Country Offices and Regional Bureau).
- Work with regional and national evaluation associations to enhance the vetted roster of evaluators who can support the new generation of evaluations. The current roster needs to include more African experts, who are knowledgeable about regional and national priorities, development issues and challenges (Evaluation Office and Regional Centre).
- Review draft evaluation TORs and provide substantive inputs with the view of enhancing their quality, consequently that of evaluation reports and their utility (Regional Bureau through provision of recruiting an evaluation advisor).

### **3.9 Use of Evaluation**

#### Relevant section of the Evaluation Policy

Senior management of Country Offices, regional bureaux, practice and policy bureaux and the associated funds and programmes will prepare management responses to all evaluations, and ensure and track appropriate, timely implementation of the agreed evaluation recommendation; draw on evaluation findings to improve the quality of programmes, guide strategic decision-making on future programming and positioning, and share knowledge on development experience, and ensure the transparency of, and public access to, all evaluation reports

#### Key issues and implication

The record on the effective and efficient use of evaluation findings and recommendations for performance improvements, accountability and learning has not been very good. The follow-up to evaluation has not always been consistent. The new management response modality was broadly

welcomed, but it was stated that it needs to be clear with UNDP, the government and partners who should provide and own the response. Some expressed a concern that without sensitizing stakeholders about the role of evaluation in performance improvement and knowledge generation, this new system might be regarded as another ‘reporting requirement to headquarters’.

When used, it has been limited to accountability and not so much for learning and performance improvement. Opportunities for involving national stakeholders in the review of evaluation findings and in the development of follow-up action points have been rather limited and almost non-existent in a substantial number of cases.

The participants identified the following as contributing factors to the limited use of evaluation:

- Weak culture of evaluation for learning;
- Lack of clear guidance on the planning and use of evaluation and lack of clarity on the incentive system for using evaluation;
- Poor quality of evaluations or unreadable evaluation reports;
- Limited dissemination of findings. Oftentimes, evaluation reports are not available in local languages.

The participants felt that the evaluation policy and the guidelines provided on the use of evaluation were quite informative and should enhance improvements in use.

It was noted that the new requirement as outlined in the policy for the Country Offices to present an evaluation plan to the Executive Board when submitting the Country Programme Document (CPD) would facilitate the systematic review of past evaluations and their use when designing the CPD.

#### Recommended actions

- Develop clear guidance for ensuring inclusive partnership with the view to enhancing ownership and thus the use of evaluation (Evaluation Office).
- Discuss evaluation findings with government counterparts and develop a response to the use of the evaluation findings and recommendations in close collaboration with appropriate government counterparts (Country Offices).
- Improve dissemination of evaluation reports and findings. As a minimum, every stakeholder involved in the evaluation process should receive a copy of the report and a short description how the evaluation is going to be used (Country Offices).
- Ensure that evaluations in UNDP contribute to generation of knowledge and learning and should be shared widely outside the circle of intended users. This includes involving members of parliament, media and academia in the dissemination process, and sharing reports and key findings through EvalNet and the Evaluation Resource Centre (Country Offices).

### **3.10 Line Oversight and Accountability Mechanisms**

#### *Key issues and implications*

The Evaluation policy was seen as a significant breakthrough in outlining the roles and responsibilities of the organisation's key constituents, and in establishing the oversight functions in the implementation of the policy. However, there is a need to clarify the accountability mechanisms in ensuring the implementation of the policy at the operational level. The participants expressed concerns that the evaluation policy does not spell out the accountability mechanisms for ensuring that the effective and timely implementation of the policy, as well as the recommendations emanating from this workshop. The on-going re-structuring of the Regional Bureau presents an opportunity for integrating the requirements of the policy into the newly formulated structures. Doing so calls for clarification as to who is accountable for what and to whom, and how the line of oversight is enforced in the policy implementation.

#### *Recommended actions*

- The role of oversight, including its location, separation between the support functions at the Regional Centre level and oversight functions at the HQ Regional Bureau level need to be clearly defined (Regional Bureau).
- The data in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC), particularly its dashboard which provides an overview of the evaluation activities in a given programme unit, should be used effectively by the line oversight unit to ensure the evaluation compliance and timely use of evaluation findings and recommendations in the Country Offices (Regional Bureau).
- Develop a clear accountability mechanism to hold Country Office senior management (Resident Representatives and Deputy Resident Representatives-Programme) accountable to the implementation of the evaluation policy (Regional Bureau).

### **4. Way forward on implementing the policy**

The final session of the workshop provided the basis for country groups (UNDP with national government counterparts) to consider what actions they will take in implementing the evaluation policy, and what recommendations they may have for other units to support this process. The main issues raised in the session have been drawn together with the key recommendations actions made during the entire workshop and summarized below. Detailed actions presented by country teams at the workshop can be found at the workshop webpage.

#### *To the Regional Bureau for Africa and Regional Service Centre in Johannesburg:*

- Create the position of Evaluation Advisor in the Regional Service Centre to establish regional capacity in M&E to backstop Country Offices on technical issues (e.g. indicator selection and formulation, templates for monitoring systems etc.).
- Enhance quality controls to ensure that indicators and CO monitoring systems in general meet minimum quality standards.
- Explore opportunities for providing UNDP Country Offices with resources to enhance the evaluation function and the quality of evaluation.
- Develop a regional programme to support Evaluation Capacity Development for government and national counterparts in the region.

*To the Evaluation Office:*

- Develop clear guidance for ensuring inclusive partnership with the view of enhancing ownership and thus the use of evaluation.
- Work with the Learning Resource Centre to develop on-line evaluation training modules to strengthen the in-house capacity and systems on monitoring and evaluation.
- In collaboration with UNDG and UNEG, improve guidelines on developing an UNDAF M&E framework and provide technical guidance.
- Through ERC, EvalNet and other tools, continue providing a forum for sharing experiences and knowledge in evaluation and good practices across the organization.
- Work with regional/national evaluation associations and academic institutions to develop required skill sets among evaluators in Africa to conduct outcome evaluations.
- In collaboration with regional/national evaluation associations, identify African evaluators who can support the new generation of evaluations to be included in the Evaluation Office managed roster of evaluators.
- Ensure timely translation of resource materials, guidelines and corporate evaluation reports into French as the majority of existing resources are only available in English.
- Whenever possible and relevant, provide technical referral or guidance on evaluation matters including evaluation capacity development.
- Ensure that the new M&E Handbook provides specific guidelines on mainstreaming gender and human rights in evaluation.

*To other Headquarters Bureaux and units:*

- Strengthen ATLAS to better support effective monitoring (Bureau of Management and Operations Support Group with Evaluation Office)

*To Country Offices working together with Government:*

Strengthen national ownership of UNDP evaluations

- Ensure broader involvement and ownership of evaluation throughout the evaluation process, including the development of an evaluation plan, the design of TOR, the selection of evaluation consultants, the review of evaluation reports and preparation of a management response to evaluation findings and recommendations.
- Work with national evaluation associations, universities and research institutions to develop culture of evaluation and promote evaluation for development effectiveness.
- Establish evaluation focal points within national M&E systems to enhance the alignment of the UNDP M&E work with the national system and improve the opportunities for mutual learning and knowledge sharing.

Strengthen national capacity for evaluation

- Conduct a diagnostic study of national M&E systems in new aid modalities and define the niche for UNDP to provide capacity development support. This requires a development of methodologies and approaches to meet emerging demands.
- Provide support in enhancing coordination with other development partners in M&E.

Strengthen in-house capacity, systems and quality

Ensure adequate institutional arrangements and capacity for monitoring and evaluation:

- For large Country Offices; review the establishment of monitoring, evaluation and knowledge management units. The Indonesia CO provides a strong case example.
- For small Country Offices; ensure that at least one person is responsible explicitly for evaluations, providing technical backstopping and a quality control function for evaluations. For smaller offices, creating a position of a dedicated M&E professional at the UN level (e.g. based in the RC office cost-shared by UNCT members) should be considered.
- Mainstream monitoring responsibility in the day-to-day work of programme officers. This should be a core task of a staff member and should be reflected in his/her TORs and RCA process.
- Ensure that consistent planning for evaluations and earmarking funds become standard practice in line with the Evaluation Policy.
- Whenever possible, explore cost-sharing opportunities for outcome evaluations with government and other partners associated with the result being evaluated.
- Ensure the development of robust results frameworks with clearly defined targets and indicators, and making baseline data available at the outset of the CPD/CPAP design.
- Mainstream gender and human rights at the programme design stage by developing clear gender responsive baseline data and indicators.

#### Enhance the use of evaluations

- Prepare evaluation plans at the outset of the programme formulation and include them in the programme documents submitted to the Executive Board. Review evaluation plans annually as part of programme reviews.
- Improve existing dissemination practices of evaluation reports and findings. As a minimum, every stakeholder involved in the evaluation process should receive a copy of the report and a short description how the evaluation is going to be used.
- Contribute to generation of knowledge and learning and should be shared widely outside the circle of intended users. This includes involving members of the parliament, media and academia in the dissemination process, and sharing reports and key findings through EvalNet and the Evaluation Resource Centre.

## Annex 1. Agenda

Birchwood Executive Hotel  
Johannesburg, South Africa  
28th Nov - 1st Dec 2006

### AGENDA

<b>REGISTRATION</b>		<b>Monday, 27<sup>th</sup> November</b>
6:00-9:00pm	Registration	<i>Workshop Secretariat (Chapel)</i>

<b>DAY 1</b>		<b>Tuesday, 28<sup>th</sup> November</b>
7:15 - 8:00	<b>REGISTRATION</b>	<i>Outside the Plenary Room (Candlewood)</i>

8:00 - 8:15	<b>OPENING AND WELCOME</b> <i>Chaired by Saraswathi Menon, Evaluation Office</i>	
	Video presentation	Gilbert Hounbo, <i>Regional Bureau for Africa</i>
	Welcome	Joseph Mugore, <i>Johannesburg Regional Service Centre</i>
8:15 - 8:30	Presentation of the workshop agenda	Sukai Prom-Jackson, <i>Evaluation Office</i>

#### **SESSION 1: REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES AND EVALUATION**

*Chaired by Henri Raubenheimer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South Africa*

*Session Objective: To address key regional development priorities and challenges, and the evolution of the evaluation function in Africa.*

8:30 - 10:00	Keynote Address: Development priorities and the role of evaluation in Africa	H.E. Ambassador Crispin Grey-Johnson of the Gambia, <i>Vice Pres. for Africa on the Bureau of the Executive Board</i>
	Directions for development evaluation in UNDP	Saraswathi Menon, <i>Evaluation Office</i>
	<i>Discussion in Plenary</i>	

10:00 - 10:30 **Break**

#### **SESSION 2: MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN THE NATIONAL CONTEXT**

*Chaired by Joseph Mugore, Johannesburg Regional Service Centre*

*Session Objective: To outline self-directed solutions, approaches and systems in addressing regional and national challenges and how they contribute to accountability, learning and improvement across the board at the national level.*

10:30 - 12:30	National M&E system, policy and the impact of ReNSE	Yayé Seydou, <i>Government of Niger</i>
	Civil society monitoring of poverty: Case from Ghana	Sulley Gariba, <i>International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)</i>
	African Evaluation Association (AfrEA)	Oumoul Khayri Ba Tall, <i>AfrEA</i>
	Role of African Universities in Evaluation	Karen Odhiambo, <i>University of Nairobi</i>
	<i>Discussion in Plenary</i>	

12:30-12:45	<b>Group Photo</b>	
12:45 - 2:00	<b>Lunch</b>	
2:00 - 3:30	Small group work	Candlewood, Ash, Heron, Petit Terrace
3:30 - 4:00	<b>Break</b>	
4:00 - 5:30	Reporting in Plenary	Candlewood
6:30 - 8:30	<b>Reception</b>	Burma

**Rapporteurs, Day 1**

Joaquin Gonzalez-Aleman, UNICEF  
 Rosetti Nabbumba Nayenga, Govt of Uganda  
 Daniela Gregr, UNDP Niger

<b>DAY 2</b>	<b>Wednesday, 29<sup>th</sup> November</b>
--------------	--

8:00 - 8:15	Overview of Day 1 and Presentation of Day 2	Evaluation Office
-------------	---	-------------------

**SESSION 3: UNDP EVALUATION POLICY AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE WAY UNDP WORKS**

*Chaired by Sulley Gariba, IDEAS*

*Session Objective:* To establish a clear understanding of UNDP Evaluation Policy, while highlighting key parameters of the policy, roles and responsibilities for evaluation across the organization, existing support systems and mechanisms at the corporate level to support the implementation of the policy at the country level, as outlined in the policy.

8:15 - 10:00	Key parameters of the UNDP Evaluation Policy  Q&A	Saraswathi Menon, <i>Evaluation Office</i>
10:00 - 10:30	<b>Break</b>	
10:30-12:00	UNDP Country Office M&E Systems  Q&A	Alex Rusita, <i>UNDP Somalia</i> Amadu Camara, <i>UNDP Guinea Bissau</i> Toshihiro Nakamura, <i>UNDP Indonesia</i> (Video)
12:00-1:00	Support Systems in Implementing the Evaluation Policy Presentations by: <i>Evaluation Office</i>  <i>Regional Bureau for Africa</i>  <i>Discussion in Plenary</i>  Gender and Human Rights in Evaluation  Q&A	Sukai Prom-Jackson, David Rider Smith, & Azusa Kubota Joseph Mugore  Letty Chiwara, <i>UNIFEM</i> Adeline Sibanda, <i>AGDEN</i>
1:00-2:00	<b>Lunch</b>	

2:00 - 3:30	<i>Small group work</i>	<i>Candlewood, Ash, Heron, Petit Terrace</i>
	Group 1: Human Rights and Gender in Evaluation Group 2: Institutional Arrangements and Resources for Evaluation (2 groups) Group 3: Evaluation Planning and Using Evaluation Group 4: Commissioning Evaluation Group 5: Outcome Evaluation	
3:30 - 4:00	<b>Break</b>	
4:00 - 6:00	<i>Reporting in Plenary</i>	<i>Candlewood</i>

**Rapporteurs, Day 2**

*Rose Ssebatindira, UNDP Uganda*  
*Fernando Abaga, UNDP Comoros*  
*Janet Macharia, Johannesburg Regional Service Centre*

**DAY 3**

**Thursday, 30<sup>th</sup> November**

**SESSION 4: UN REFORM AND EVALUATION**

*Chaired by H.E. Ambassador Grey-Johnson*

*Session Objective: To discuss the implications of UN reform for evaluation, key issues and challenges in evaluation in the context of the UN reform agenda.*

8:00-10:00	UN Reform and Evaluation	Saraswathi Menon, <i>UNEG</i>
	One Office initiative and evaluation	Jeanne Gouba, <i>Office of United Nations Funds and Programmes, Cape Verde</i>
	Country-led UNDAF and M&E system	Henri Raubenheimer, <i>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South Africa</i> Phillip Browne, <i>UNDP South Africa</i> Julianna Lindsey, <i>UNICEF South Africa</i>
	UNDAF M&E and Evaluability Assessment	Joaquin Gonzalez-Aleman, <i>UNEG</i>
	<i>Q&amp;A and Discussion in Plenary</i>	

10:00-10:30 **Break**

**SESSION 5: THEMATIC ISSUES AND APPROACHES IN EVALUATION**

*Chaired by TBD*

*Session Objective: To present and discuss thematic issues and approaches in evaluation based on lessons learned from recent thematic evaluations.*

10:30-12:30	Lessons from the Evaluation of UNDP Assistance to Conflict-Affected Countries	Saraswathi Menon, <i>Evaluation Office</i>
	Lessons from the Evaluation of UNDP's Role and Contribution in the HIV/AIDS Response in Southern Africa and Ethiopia	Sulley Gariba, <i>IDEAS</i>

*Q&A and Discussion in Plenary*

	OAPR Role in Monitoring and Evaluation	Izumi Morota, <i>Office of Audit and Performance</i>
12:30-1:30	<b>Lunch</b>	
1:30-3:00	<i>Reporting in Plenary from Day 2 Small Group Work</i>	<i>Candlewood</i>
3:00-3:30	<b>Break</b>	

**SESSION 6: THE WAY FORWARD**

*Chaired by Saraswathi Menon, Evaluation Office*

*Session Objective:* To identify next steps, including roles and responsibilities, in implementing the policy by country teams (UNDP and Govt.) and recommendations for all.

3:30-3:45	Key Outcomes of Days 1 and 2 Q&A	Rapporteurs from Days 1 and 2
3:45-6:00	Implementing the Policy	Working Groups, <i>Country Teams</i>

***Rapporteurs, Day 3***

*Alex Rusita, UNDP Somalia*

*Adeline Shibanda, Resource person*

**DAY 4**

**Friday, 1<sup>st</sup> December**

8:00 - 8:15	Overview of Day 3 and Presentation of Day 4	Sukai Prom-Jackson, <i>Evaluation Office</i>
-------------	---	--

**Session 6: THE WAY FORWARD (continued)**

*Chaired by Saraswathi Menon, Evaluation Office*

8:15-8:30	Report on Key Outcomes Q&A	<i>Rapporteurs Days 1, 2 and 3</i>
8:15 - 10:00	<i>Presentations by Working Groups</i> Q&A	Working Groups 1, 2 and 4, <i>Country Teams</i>
10:00 - 10:30	<b>Break</b>	
10:30-12:00	<i>Presentations by Working Groups 5, and 6 (continued)</i> Q&A <i>Discussion in Plenary</i>	Working Groups 4, 5, and 6, <i>Country Teams</i>
12:00-1:00	<b>Response and Closing</b>	H.E. Ambassador Crispin Grey-Johnson of the Gambia, <i>UNDP Executive Board</i> Gilbert Hounbo, <i>Regional Bureau for Africa</i> Scholastica Kimaryo, <i>UN/UNDP South Africa</i> Saraswathi Menon, <i>Evaluation Office</i>

## Annex 2. List of Participants

Angola	Gilberto Ribeiro	National Economist	<a href="mailto:gilberto.ribeiro@undp.org">gilberto.ribeiro@undp.org</a>
	Malaquias Tenente	Programme Associate	<a href="mailto:malaquias.tenente@undp.org">malaquias.tenente@undp.org</a>
Benin	Médard Padonou	Responsible Suivi Evaluation, Government Benin	<a href="mailto:pamedeux@yahoo.fr">pamedeux@yahoo.fr</a>
	Idrissa Diagne	Senior Economist	<a href="mailto:idrissa.diagne@undp.org">idrissa.diagne@undp.org</a>
	Agbodji Housensou	Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:agbodji.housensou@undp.org">agbodji.housensou@undp.org</a>
Botswana	Rebonyebatho Bonang Moaneng	ARR-P	<a href="mailto:r.moaneng@undp.org">r.moaneng@undp.org</a>
	Iris Molosankwe	Programme Associate	<a href="mailto:iris.molosankwe@undp.org">iris.molosankwe@undp.org</a>
	Resego Taolo	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	<a href="mailto:taolo@bidpa.bw">taolo@bidpa.bw</a>
Burkina Faso	Alizatta Tamboula	ARR-P	<a href="mailto:alizatta.tamboula@undp.org">alizatta.tamboula@undp.org</a>
	Noellie Victoire Koné	Conseiller Aff. Economiques, Ministère des Financial Budget, Direct Generale de les cooperation	<a href="mailto:victoirtou@hotmail.com">victoirtou@hotmail.com</a>
Cape Verde	Jeanne Gouba	DRR	<a href="mailto:jeanne.gouba@cv.jo.un.org">jeanne.gouba@cv.jo.un.org</a>
Central African Republic	Victor Mazanga	Directeur des Investissements Publics, Ministère de l'Economie, du Plan et de la Coopération Internationale	
	Maxime Mbringa-Takama	ARR-P	<a href="mailto:maxime.mbringa-takama@undp.org">maxime.mbringa-takama@undp.org</a>
	Ousmane Niang	Economist	<a href="mailto:ousmane.niang@undp.org">ousmane.niang@undp.org</a>
Chad	Masra Tamtangar Ngoidi	National Economist	<a href="mailto:masra.ngoidi@undp.org">masra.ngoidi@undp.org</a>
	Madingar Alngar	Head of PMSU	<a href="mailto:jerome.madingar@undp.org">jerome.madingar@undp.org</a>
	Bachar Brahim Adoum	Under Secretary-General: Ministry of Finance, Economy & Planning	<a href="mailto:brahim.bachar@caramail.com">brahim.bachar@caramail.com</a>
Comoros	Fernando Abaga	DRR	<a href="mailto:fernando.abaga@undp.org">fernando.abaga@undp.org</a>
	Abdallah Ahmed	Ministry of External Relations	<a href="mailto:yousahmed@yahoo.com">yousahmed@yahoo.com</a>
Eritrea	Bartholmew Nyarko-Mensah	Senior DRR	<a href="mailto:b.nyarko-mensah@undp.org">b.nyarko-mensah@undp.org</a>
	Rahel Hailelassie	Programme Associate	<a href="mailto:rahel.hailelassie@undp.org">rahel.hailelassie@undp.org</a>
Ethiopia	Admasu Nebebe Gedamu	UN Team Leader and National Programme Coordinator	<a href="mailto:admasugedamu@yahoo.com">admasugedamu@yahoo.com</a>
	Joe Feeney	Programme Advisor	<a href="mailto:joe.feeney@undp.org">joe.feeney@undp.org</a>
Gabon	Joseph Paul Ibouili	Director of General Planning	<a href="mailto:ibouili_maganga@yahoo.fr">ibouili_maganga@yahoo.fr</a>
Gambia	Vitalie Muntean	DRR	<a href="mailto:vitalie.muntean@undp.org">vitalie.muntean@undp.org</a>
	Mamour Jagne	Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:mamour.a.jagne@undp.org">mamour.a.jagne@undp.org</a>
	Mr. Ansumane Sanneh	Senior Economist	<a href="mailto:ansumanas@yahoo.com">ansumanas@yahoo.com</a>
Ghana	Yasuko Kusakari	Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:yasuko.kusakari@undp.org">yasuko.kusakari@undp.org</a>
	Yaw Okyere-Nyako	Ministry of Finance & Economic Planning	<a href="mailto:yawvon99@hotmail.com">yawvon99@hotmail.com</a>
Guinea	Oumou Camara Diallo	Director Poverty Programme	<a href="mailto:oumcamdiallo@yahoo.fr">oumcamdiallo@yahoo.fr</a>
	Roger Pactrick Milimono	National Director DAP/Poverty	<a href="mailto:rmilimono@yahoo.fr">rmilimono@yahoo.fr</a>
	Youssouf Dioubate	Programme Specialist Poverty	<a href="mailto:youssouf.dioubate@undp.org">youssouf.dioubate@undp.org</a>
Guinea-Bissau	Amadu Bailo Camara	Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:amadu.b.camara@undp.org">amadu.b.camara@undp.org</a>

Kenya	Bernard Masiga	Deputy Chief Economist, Ministry of Finance	<a href="mailto:bmasiga@treasury.go.ke">bmasiga@treasury.go.ke</a>
	Rose Muchiri	M&E Focal Point	<a href="mailto:rose.muchiri@undp.org">rose.muchiri@undp.org</a>
Lesotho	Charu Bist	M & E Focal Point	
	Ntsiuoa Jaase	JPO	
Liberia	Emmett Watson	ARR-P	<a href="mailto:emmett.watson@undp.org">emmett.watson@undp.org</a>
	Wilmot Reeves	National Economist	<a href="mailto:wilmot.reeves@undp.org">wilmot.reeves@undp.org</a>
	James D. Kormon Jr.	National Economist	
Madagascar	Fara Ravololondramiarana	National Economist	<a href="mailto:fara.ravololondramiarana@undp.org">fara.ravololondramiarana@undp.org</a>
	Isiyaka Sabo	Economic Advisor	<a href="mailto:isiyaka.sabo@undp.org">isiyaka.sabo@undp.org</a>
	Félix Rabemanambola	Government Representative	
Malawi	Etta Mmangisa	Programme Analyst	<a href="mailto:etta.mmangisa@undp.org">etta.mmangisa@undp.org</a>
Mauritania	Aichetou Wague	Poverty Thematic Leader	<a href="mailto:aichetou.wague@undp.org">aichetou.wague@undp.org</a>
	Fah Ould Brahim Ould Jiddou	Conseiller Technique	<a href="mailto:fah_brahim@yahoo.fr">fah_brahim@yahoo.fr</a>
Mauritius	Magda Verdik	ARR-P/ Senior Programme Manager	<a href="mailto:magda.verdickt@undp.org">magda.verdickt@undp.org</a>
	Chandrani Devi Gopaul	Ministry of Finance & Economic Development	<a href="mailto:cgopaul@mail.gov.mu">cgopaul@mail.gov.mu</a>
Mozambique	Inacia Salvador	ARR	<a href="mailto:inacia.salvador@undp.org">inacia.salvador@undp.org</a>
	Momad Saide	National Economist-National Counterpart	<a href="mailto:momadesaide@dnpo.gov.mz">momadesaide@dnpo.gov.mz</a>
	Youssef Mbechezi	ARR-P	<a href="mailto:youssef.mbechezi@undp.org">youssef.mbechezi@undp.org</a>
	Roberto Salomão	Minister of Planning, Mozambique	<a href="mailto:robertosalomao@dnpo.gov.mz">robertosalomao@dnpo.gov.mz</a>
Namibia	Cloudina Ngavetene	UNDP	<a href="mailto:Cloudina.ngavetene@undp.org">Cloudina.ngavetene@undp.org</a>
	Aili Andreas	UNDP	<a href="mailto:Aili.andres@undp.org">Aili.andres@undp.org</a>
	Johan Ashipala	Government Representative	
Niger	Daniela Gregr	Associate Economist	<a href="mailto:daniela.gregr@undp.org">daniela.gregr@undp.org</a>
	Keita Maria Iboune	Results Based Management Analyst	<a href="mailto:maria.iboune@undp.org">maria.iboune@undp.org</a>
	Idé Adamou Hassane	Programme Bonne Gouvernance et Croissance mieux repartau	<a href="mailto:hassaneidea@yahoo.fr">hassaneidea@yahoo.fr</a>
	Yayé Seydou	Directeur Generale de L'Evaluation Des Programmes de Development	<a href="mailto:syaye@caramail.com">syaye@caramail.com</a>
Nigeria	Gabriela Spirli	Poverty Specialist	<a href="mailto:gabriella.spirli@undp.org">gabriella.spirli@undp.org</a>
	Kabiru Nasidi	Director of the Monitoring and Evaluation Department, Ministry of Economy and Finance	<a href="mailto:kabiru.nasidi@undp.org">kabiru.nasidi@undp.org</a>
	B. O. Akpanyung	National Planning Commission	<a href="mailto:bassey.akpanyung@gmail.com">bassey.akpanyung@gmail.com</a>
Senegal	Ingrid Cyimana	DRR	<a href="mailto:ingrid.cyimana@undp.org">ingrid.cyimana@undp.org</a>
	Bakary Signate	Coordonnateur Cellule d'Appui aux Projets (CAP)	<a href="mailto:bakarysignate@yahoo.fr">bakarysignate@yahoo.fr</a>
	Cheike Tisiane Mbengue	Program Manager/Economist	<a href="mailto:cheikh.tidiane.mbenque@undp.org">cheikh.tidiane.mbenque@undp.org</a>
Seychelles	Roland Alcindor	Economist	<a href="mailto:roland.alcindor@undp.org">roland.alcindor@undp.org</a>
	Jeanette d'Offay	Government of Seychelles, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<a href="mailto:jdoffay@mfa.gov.sc">jdoffay@mfa.gov.sc</a>

Sierra Leone	Umaru Sesay	Finance Officer	<a href="mailto:umaru.sesay@undp.org">umaru.sesay@undp.org</a>
	Desmond S. Koroma	Principal Planning Office, Sierra Leone Government	
South Africa	Monah Andriambalo	UNCDF - Regional Unit	<a href="mailto:monah.andriambalo@undp.org">monah.andriambalo@undp.org</a>
	Philip Browne	UNDP	<a href="mailto:philip.browne@undp.org">philip.browne@undp.org</a>
	Fode Ndiaye	Regional Technical Manager	<a href="mailto:fode.ndiaye@undp.org">fode.ndiaye@undp.org</a>
	Janet Macharia	Gender Advisor, RSC Johannesburg	<a href="mailto:Janet.macharia@undp.org">Janet.macharia@undp.org</a>
Swaziland	Sakinah Morris	Programme Associate	<a href="mailto:sakinah.morris@undp.org">sakinah.morris@undp.org</a>
	Allen Dlamini	Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:allen.dlamini@undp.org">allen.dlamini@undp.org</a>
	Donald Ndwandwe	Senior Economist	<a href="mailto:ndwandwed@gov.sz">ndwandwed@gov.sz</a>
Tanzania	Ernest Salla	DRR-P	<a href="mailto:ernest.salla@undp.org">ernest.salla@undp.org</a>
Uganda	Rose Ssebatindira	ARR	<a href="mailto:rose.ssebatindira@undp.org">rose.ssebatindira@undp.org</a>
	Rosetti Nabbumba Nayenga	Ministry of Finance, Planning & Economic Development	<a href="mailto:rosseti.nabbumba@finance.go.ug">rosseti.nabbumba@finance.go.ug</a>
Zambia	Amos Muchanga	Programme Analyst	<a href="mailto:amos.muchanga@undp.org">amos.muchanga@undp.org</a>
Zimbabwe	Mfaro Moyo	ARR	<a href="mailto:mfaro.moyo@undp.org">mfaro.moyo@undp.org</a>
	Nomasomi Mpfu	ARR (Gender)	<a href="mailto:nomasomi.mpfu@undp.org">nomasomi.mpfu@undp.org</a>
	Nhlanga Solomon	Government Representative	
<b>Panellists, Chairs, Additional Presenters, and Resource Persons</b>			
H.E. Ambassador Grey Johnson	Vice President for Africa & Chair UNDP Bureau of the Executive Board		
Gilbert Fossoun Hougbo	Assistant Administrator and Regional Director for the Regional Bureau for Africa		<a href="mailto:gilbert.hougbo@undp.org">gilbert.hougbo@undp.org</a>
Joseph Mugore	Officer-in-Charge, Regional Service Centre, Johannesburg		<a href="mailto:joseph.mugore@undp.org">joseph.mugore@undp.org</a>
Scholastica Kimaryo	RR UNDP , RC UN South Africa		<a href="mailto:scholastica.kimaryo@undp.org">scholastica.kimaryo@undp.org</a>
Henri Raubenheimer	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South Africa		<a href="mailto:Raubenheimerh@foreign.gov.za">Raubenheimerh@foreign.gov.za</a>
Sulley Gariba	Executive Director - Gariba Development Associates, IDEA		<a href="mailto:sulleygariba@hotmail.com">sulleygariba@hotmail.com</a>
Letty Chiwara	Programme Specialist, Africa Section, UNIFEM		<a href="mailto:letty.chiwara@unifem.org">letty.chiwara@unifem.org</a>
Oumoul Khayri Ba Tall	President, Africa Evaluation Association (AfrEA)		<a href="mailto:oktconsult@gmail.com">oktconsult@gmail.com</a>
Karen Odhiambo	University of Nairobi		<a href="mailto:karenodhiambo1@yahoo.co.uk">karenodhiambo1@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Adeline Sibanda	Africa Gender and Development Evaluators Network		<a href="mailto:troparg@ecoweb.co.zw">troparg@ecoweb.co.zw</a>
Alex Rusita	Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor, UNDP Somalia		<a href="mailto:alex.rusita@undp.org">alex.rusita@undp.org</a>
Toshihiro Nakamura	ARR, Planning and M&E Unit, UNDP Indonesia		<a href="mailto:toshihiro.nakamura@undp.org">toshihiro.nakamura@undp.org</a>
Juiliana Lindsay	Senior Programme Officer, UNICEF South Africa		<a href="mailto:jlindsey@unicef.org">jlindsey@unicef.org</a>
Joaquin Gonzalez-Aleman	UNEG, Project Officer, Evaluation Office UNICEF		<a href="mailto:jgonzalezaleman@unicef.org">jgonzalezaleman@unicef.org</a>
Izumi Morota	Audit Specialist, Office of Audit and Peer Review		<a href="mailto:izumi.morota@undp.org">izumi.morota@undp.org</a>

<b>Evaluation Office</b>		
Saraswathi Menon	Director, Evaluation Office	Saraswathi.menon@undp.org
Sukai Prom-Jackson	Evaluation Adviser, Evaluation Office	<a href="mailto:sukai.prom-jackson@undp.org">sukai.prom-jackson@undp.org</a>
David Rider Smith	Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office	<a href="mailto:david.rider.smith@undp.org">david.rider.smith@undp.org</a>
Azusa Kubota	Evaluation Analyst, Evaluation Office	<a href="mailto:azusa.kubota@undp.org">azusa.kubota@undp.org</a>
Kutisha Ebron	Programme Associate, Evaluation Office	<a href="mailto:kutisha.ebron@undp.org">kutisha.ebron@undp.org</a>
<b>Logistic Team Members</b>		
Michael Morgan	Operations Manager, RSC South Africa	Michael.morgan@undp.org
Zukiswa Luthayi	Procurement Specialist, RSC South Africa	Zukiswa.luthyai@undp.org
Yazmin Nanji	Workshop Consultant	<a href="mailto:yazmin.nznji@undp.org">yazmin.nznji@undp.org</a>
Kimberly Khoza	Workshop Consultant	

### Annex 3. Summary of Ratings from Workshop Evaluation by Participants

#### 1. Did the various sessions help you achieve the workshop objectives?

	Not at all	Partially	Largely	Completely	No response	Total of Largely and Completely	# respondents and Response Rate
<b>Session 1: Regional Development Priorities and Evaluation</b>	0	13	4	8	1	79%	65 (77%)
	0%	20%	62%	17%			
<i>Comments:</i>							
- Bonne definition des priorités.							
- Good presentations to launch discussion.							
<b>Session 2: Monitoring and Evaluation in the National Context</b>	0	16	35	14		74%	66 (79%)
	2%	24%	53%	21%			
<i>Comments:</i>							
- Presentations were too general							
- C'était une revue de la situation, pas des débats de ce qui aurait pu être amélioré.							
<b>Session 3: UNDP Evaluation Policy</b>	0	7	37	22		89%	66 (79%)
	0%	11%	56%	33%			
<i>Comments:</i>							
- It was very helpful for work in the Country Office.							
- Needed more time to understand the new RBA strategy.							
<b>Session 4: UN Reform and Evaluation</b>	0	13	41	12		80%	66 (79%)
	0%	20%	62%	18%			
<i>Comments:</i>							
- Interesting presentations, but some of them were too long.							
<b>Session 5: Thematic Issues and Approaches in Evaluations</b>	1	13	34	18		79%	66 (79%)
	2%	15%	52%	27%			
<i>Comments:</i>							
- Interesting information.							
<b>Average</b>						<b>80%</b>	

## 2. Was the way the workshop was structured and delivered useful in achieving the objectives of the workshop?

	Not at all	Partially	Largely	Completely	No response	Total of Largely and Completely	# respondents and Response Rate
<b>Plenary presentations</b>	1 2%	10 15%	41 62%	13 20%	1	82%	65 (77%)
<i>Comments:</i>							
- Tops de presentations. - Some presentations were too long.							
<b>Group work</b>	1 2%	6 9%	31 47%	25 38%	3	85%	63 (75%)
<i>Comments:</i>							
- Very interactive and sharing of experience was useful. - Time and content were somewhat lost in translation.							
<b>Reporting back from groups</b>	0 0%	3 5%	41 62%	19 29%	3	91%	63 (75%)
<i>Comments:</i>							
- A standard format for reporting would have been useful. - Not enough time was given.							
<b>Plenary discussions</b>	1 2%	5 8%	36 55%	21 32%	3	87%	63 (75%)
<i>Comments:</i>							
- Needed more time for discussions.							
<b>Average</b>						<b>86%</b>	

## 3. Other comments, suggestions and recommendations

### Strengths

- Well organized in view of the number of participants.
- Great idea to bring together UNDP and government. It should be continued.
- The process and structure of the workshop was well thought out and structured.
- Logistics were impressive task and highly collaborative atmosphere.
- Having to develop an action plan forced one to reflect on what we have learned.

### Weaknesses

- There were some issues that seemed to have separated UNDP and government staff.

- The number of presentations needs to be limited per session to allow more time for discussions.
- Les journées de travail ont été très longues.
- Interpretation was weak and limited understanding.

## **Suggestions and Recommendations**

### **Content-related**

- Participants should be provided with a list of UN acronyms.
- It would have been better to have more presentations by M&E specialists from UNDP and UNEG.

### **Structure & Process**

- Starting the session at 8 am was problematic.
- Needed to have more free time. A tour of the city would have been nice.
- Next workshop should be for one week to sufficiently cover the content.
- Capturing key points from Day 1 on Day 2 and mapping out the plan for the day were helpful.
- This should have been done for other days.
- Self-introduction at the beginning of the workshop would have been useful.
- It would have been better to organize the workshop with 30-40 people.

### **Follow-up**

- *It was a very useful workshop to our day-to-day work as we had no idea about the implications of the Evaluation Policy.*
- Provide a discussion forum/network for the participants to share their evaluation policy implementation progress.
- *I recommend that EO organizes a similar workshop for RR/DRR in order to push for the implementation of the policy.*