



## General Assembly

**Distr.**

GENERAL

A/41/201

7 March 1986

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: **ARABIC/CHINESE/ENGLISH/  
FRENCH/RUSSIAN/SPANISH**

Forty-first session  
Item 118 of the preliminary list\*

JOINT INSPECTION UNIT

Status of internal evaluation in organisations of the  
United Nations system

Note by the Secretary-General

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the General Assembly the report of the Joint Inspection unit entitled "Status of internal evaluation in organisations of the United Nations system" (JIU/REP/85/10).

---

\* A/41/50.

## ANNEX

## STATUS OF INTERNAL EVALUATION IN ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

Prepared by  
**Earl D. Sohm**  
 Joint Inspection Unit

Table of Contents

	<u>Paragraphs</u>	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1 - 4	1
I. UNITED NATIONS	5 - 30	1
<b>II. UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (UNICEF)</b>	31 - 39	8
III. UNITED NATIONS CENTRE FOR HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (HABITAT) (UNCHS)	40 - 45	9
IV. UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (UNCTAD)	46 - 52	10
V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTRE UNCTAD/GATT (ITC)	53 - 60	11
VI. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)	61 - 70	13
<b>VII. UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)</b>	71 - 77	15
<b>VIII. UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (UNFPA)</b>	78 - 85	16
IX. OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)	86 - 92	18
x. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)	93 - 100	19
XI. INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)	101 - 108	20
<b>XII. INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO)</b>	109 - 115	22
XIII. INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD)	116 - 122	23
<b>XIV. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (ILO)</b>	123 - 129	24
<b>XV. INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION (IMO)</b>	130 - 134	25
XVI. INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)	135 - 140	26
XVII. UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)	141 - 149	28
XVIII. UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)	150 - 156	29
XIX. UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION (UPU)	157 - 161	31
XX. WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (WFP)	162 - 169	32
<b>XXI. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)</b>	170 - 178	33
XXII. WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)	179 - 184	35
XXIII. WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO)	185 - 190	36
XXIV. WORLD BANK	191 - 193	37
<b>Annex I: Selected Bibliography of Recent Documents</b>		
<b>Annex 11: Summary of Companion Report JIU/REP/85/11</b>		

## INTRODUCTION

1. Evaluation is a process which attempts to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of activities in the light of their objectives. 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 an initial report on the status of evaluation in the **United Nations** system (**JIU/REP/77/1**) which found that, following several decades of fluctuating attention, there was increasing interest in evaluation which appeared to be at a **"take-off"** point. In 1981 **JIU** issued two further reports on the status of evaluation in individual **organizations** (**JIU/REP/81/5**) and system-wide (**JIU/REP/81/6**). These reports showed a **very** considerable expansion of evaluation activity, but observed that much remained to be done to ensure that the new or improved evaluation systems were firmly established and would actually be used **to** carefully assess results and improve **programmes**.

3. During late 1984 and early 1985 the JIU made a third review of **evaluation** status. Information on evaluation system activities and progress, **was** requested from all system organizations and the Inspector visited almost all of them to further discuss evaluation status, structure, progress, operations and results to date. Relevant documents, guidelines, policy statements and **reports** were reviewed, the **organizations'** views **were** solicited on system-wide **evaluation** issues, and their comments were obtained on the resulting draft reports.

4. This report contains brief summaries of the current status of evaluation in 24 organizations of the **United Nations** system (including the International Fund for Agricultural Development (**IFAD**) and the World Bank, which are not participating organizations of the **JIU**), with particular attention to progress and new developments since the 1981 reports. A summary **assessment** is included for each **organization**, together with recommendations for ten of them. A selected bibliography of recent evaluation documents of the organizations is included as Annex I. Another report (**JIU/REP/85/11**) discusses the system-wide developments, patterns, issues and problems which have occurred as these **evaluation** systems have increasingly been put into use. The summary of this overall report is included herein as Annex II.

## I. UNITED NATIONS

5. The purposes of the United Nations 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.

6. The 1981 JIU evaluation status report concluded that the United Nations had made little **progress** towards an internal evaluation system and had **not** kept pace with most other **organizations** and agencies of the United Nations system in this area. Most attention had been devoted to **strengthening** programming and to some

/...

in-depth programme evaluations. JIU recommended that a newly-established evaluation unit in DIESA be strengthened to carry out its important evaluation responsibilities in the economic and social sectors, and that the United Nations ensure co-ordination of its evaluation patterns and methodologies.

7. The General Assembly confirmed its continuing support for the development of evaluation systems and units in each United Nations system agency, as an integral part of the programming and development process, in its resolution 36/228 of December 1981. It also requested the Secretary-General to strengthen United Nations evaluation systems and units by specifying their responsibilities and tasks; preparing precise evaluation plans, design guidelines and standards; and ensuring quality control of evaluation and effective feedback. The General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report on implementation of these actions in 1983. In a 1982 resolution (37/234), the Assembly also adopted regulations governing programme planning, programme budgeting, monitoring and evaluation as instruments of integrated-management for all activities of the United Nations. (The regulations and corresponding rules were issued in June 1984 1/.)

8. The 1983 report of the Secretary-General 2/ discussed the status and functions of 17 United Nations entities which had undertaken some, little, or no evaluation activity. The report showed that there had been little overall progress in establishing key evaluation elements or in integrating evaluation into the programming cycle. It suggested staff resource levels which would be required to perform basic evaluation system functions, and described some proposed evaluation activities and possible new staffing. The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) expressed its concern at the lack of responsiveness of this report and of action to strengthen evaluation. It urged the Secretariat to consider merging the various central evaluation functions and units, and stressed the need to establish basic evaluation system guidance, methodologies, oversight, co-ordination and services 3/. The General Assembly (resolution 38/227) stated that it "deplores the continuing failure to implement" its resolution 36/228B. It reiterated the need to strengthen the capacity of evaluation units and systems, particularly in the regional commissions; called on the Secretary-General to review all possibilities for strengthening evaluation, including a timetable for adequately establishing units in 811 departments; and stressed the need to develop a comprehensive evaluation system.

9. During 1984 the Secretary-General reviewed the possibilities of establishing a new evaluation post in each of six entities through redeployment. He reported 4/, however, that despite Secretariat commitment to developing a comprehensive evaluation capacity throughout the United Nations, only a few posts could be redeployed, and only for 1984-85. He stated that he would propose "permanent solutions" for strengthening evaluation in the six entities in his proposed programme budget for 1986-87.

10. The lack of overall evaluation system progress which the General Assembly strongly criticized in 1983 continues in 1985, but it is obscured by the complex organizational structure and many units of the United Nations. There are in fact substantially more than the 17 entities of the six entities which the Secretary-General reported on in 1983 and 1984: some 24 have been identified in the economic and social sectors alone. Secretariat officials explain that entities such as UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA were not included in the evaluation status reports because they are not financed under the United Nations regular budget. However, other units that are included in the budget were not in the Secretary-General's reports: these include ECE (see D. below), UNFPA and UNDRR (see B. below), and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). (Recent JIU reports have in fact specifically recommended that evaluation functions be established in the latter two entities.) The following paragraphs divide the many United Nations entities into five broad groups in an attempt to better assess evaluation status and development.

#### A. Larger semi-autonomous entities

11. Eight entities - UNICEF, UNCHS, UNCTAD, ITC, UNDP, UNEP, UNFPA, and UNHCR - all either have established evaluation systems and unite and/or have taken significant initiatives in the past few years to develop and strengthen them. These entities are larger in size, have their own governing or oversight bodies, and most of them rely primarily on voluntary funding. They are discussed separately in the following eight sections of this report.

#### B. Smaller entities

12. Several of the various smaller funds, offices, centres and unite have also taken initiative to develop and use their own internal evaluation systems. The United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), for instance, established an evaluation system in 1981. UNFDAC uses an evaluation officer and independent consultants to perform in-depth evaluation of projects and selected groups of projects. About 10 such evaluations were made in the 1982-84 period, which were widely distributed and were also summarized in annual reporting to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. As another example, the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO) established an internal Working Group on Evaluation in 1984 to review UNDRO disaster relief and technical co-operation activities, as well as a systematic evaluation procedure and format to assess UNDRO performance in individual disaster cases.

#### C. Headquarters departments

13. Several of these units have made progress in some areas, but in general they have continued to struggle on a part-time basis to develop their evaluation system functions. The Evaluation Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (DIESA) was established in 1980 as one of two central units. Its tentative terms of reference included establishing evaluation policies and developing and maintaining an internal evaluation system for the United Nations economic and social sectors. Most of the work of the four professional staff, however, has been devoted to preparing half of the in-depth programme evaluations (one such study is programmed each year for 1984-1992) and follow-up reports for CPC, the quality of which has steadily improved 5/. A four-part Evaluation Manual has been prepared, and is to be issued in early 1986. In early 1985 the Unit began testing built-in self-evaluation in several programmes with a view to broader coverage by the end of the year, and working with other units to develop evaluation plans for each sub-programme.

14. The other central evaluation unit has been the Programme Analysis and Evaluation Unit in the Department of Administration and Management (DAM), responsible for evaluation work in the political, legal, humanitarian, public information, and common services sectors. The two professional staff of this Unit spent only a small fraction of their time on evaluation over the years, devoted to the early evaluation studies for CPC and some initial programme monitoring activities. In late 1984, a third staff member was added, in recognition of increased evaluation work stemming from responsibility for half the in-depth evaluation studies for CPC from 1984-1992 and because, as decided by the General Assembly, administrative and common service activities are now programmed and included in the United Nations medium-term plan. This latter responsibility in particular will create substantial new evaluation support responsibilities and the considerable challenge of developing appropriate evaluation methodologies for the many diverse programmes involved.

15. Governing bodies have expressed strong interest in establishing an evaluation system in the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD), which is one of the largest executing agencies for UNDP and also provides substantive and management support for other United Nations technical co-operation activities. An evaluation officer was designated in late 1983, and the Policy,

Programming and Development Planning Division now carries out evaluation, co-ordination and reporting of the project and programme activities of the Department. Several in-depth project reviews have begun, and an evaluation training programme and project evaluation guidelines have been prepared. However, DTCD subsequently decided to postpone introduction of these guidelines, which are now being incorporated as part of the official guidelines in the Evaluation Manual. Improvement of project design efforts awaits revision actions by UNDP, and evaluation of substantive programme activities awaits the issuance of the Evaluation Manual.

16. In addition, a Planning, Programming and Evaluation Unit was established in the Department of Public Information (DPI) in 1980. The Unit has no specific evaluation terms of reference, but the two professional staff have devoted part of their work to establishing a systematic departmental monitoring and reporting system and preparing several useful internal evaluation studies. DPI has also made several reports to the Committee on Information concerning the establishment of systematic evaluation procedures.

#### D. Regional economic commissions

17. During the past decade, a series of General Assembly resolutions has called for expanded and strengthened programming, co-ordinating, and operational roles and responsibilities for the regional commissions. However, the commissions have made very limited progress in developing and establishing evaluation systems, due largely to the uncertain evaluation system responsibilities, guidance and actions at United Nations headquarters and to resource constraints. The Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) expressed concern in 1984 at the lack of evaluation resources in ECA and reiterated the need to improve evaluation of programme performance and reporting on effectiveness to Member States. Subsequently, ECA deployed one post for 1984-85 to work with ECA programme managers in implementing minimal evaluation functions. The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) made an extensive evaluative review of its entire work programme in 1984, with a follow-up study in 1985, but has no evaluation staff or evaluation system. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) carries out certain evaluation activities on an ad hoc basis, but also has had no evaluation staff or system.

18. The Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) has affirmed the need to make evaluation an integral part of programme operations, and the Secretariat established two professional evaluation posts in 1983. Evaluation arrangements are now being developed for technical co-operation projects, self-evaluation of programme elements, in-depth evaluation studies, and strengthening of the overall evaluation process. The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) has made the most progress, with steady policy support from the Commission. It established an Operations Evaluation Unit in 1980, issued draft evaluation guidelines in 1982 and a final version in 1984, developed an Extra-budgetary Project Manual in 1983, has completed 19 evaluation studies of various types, and has been revising guidelines for project design. Like the other commissions, however, it is hampered by severe staffing constraints; the sole full-time evaluation officer has been supported only by extrabudgetary funds.

#### E. Central mechanisms

19. The 1981 JIU status report noted that a high-level steering committee on evaluation had been established to aid the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation (DG/DIEC) in guiding the new DIESA Evaluation Unit in the development of a comprehensive evaluation system in the economic and social sectors. In 1982 the Secretary-General established a high-level Programme Planning and Budgeting Board (PPBB) which, among other functions, is responsible for assisting him in guiding the monitoring and evaluation of United Nations programme budget implementation. In late 1982, at the request of CPC and the General Assembly, the Secretary-General also established a Central Monitoring Unit

(CMU) under the PPBB to monitor and report on programme implementation, **composed** of one part-time staff member each from the Office of the **DG/DIEC**, DAM, and **DIESA**.

20. The work of the CMU has concentrated on the programme performance reports issued every **two** years since 1980, which provide an essentially quantitative summary of the production of programme outputs. The 1984 report **6/** indicated good 'implementation performance in various budget sections, but also disclosed continuing gaps in performance data and coverage, imprecision in specifying **outputs**, and problems of substantial departures, modifications, and over-programming. Because of the very limited staff time available in the CMU, however, little progress has yet been made in the broader monitoring system development tasks of establishing a common monitoring and performance reporting methodology; strengthening monitoring capacity in individual units; establishing systematic oversight mechanisms to independently verify output production and follow-up on **implementation problems**; and, most importantly, developing data flows to permit the monitoring of output delivery and programme changes on a **much** more continuous and up-to-date basis.

#### F. Developments during 1985

21. In March 1985 the Secretary-General announced the establishment of a single Central Evaluation Unit (CEU), located in **DIESA** but reporting to both **DIESA** and DAM officials and to the PPBB. The functions of the new CEU are to help develop and implement "**a United Nations evaluation system**"; formulate overall evaluation **policies**, procedures and feedback for all programme sectors; participate in **in-depth** evaluation studies; establish and provide self-evaluation guidelines, support and training; and assist the PPBB.

22. The Secretary-General's Bulletin establishing the CEU stated that it would combine staff from **DIESA** and DAM, but it was subsequently staffed with only the four professional staff from the **DIESA** unit. DAM did provide two professionals to replace the former part-time staffing of the **CMU**. The net effects, however, are that the old **DIESA** evaluation unit has been re-named as the CEU and given heavy additional responsibilities (see paragraph 14. above) without additional resources, and that United Nations central evaluation unit professional staff have actually decreased from the former six posts in two units to four in one unit.

23. The "permanent solutions" to strengthen evaluation for a "comprehensive evaluation capacity throughout the United Nations", which the Secretary-General promised in 1984 to include in the **next** programme budget, have also been revised in a new direction. The 1986-1987 proposed programme budget provides no new posts for the (**DIESA**) CEU, and only four temporary posts elsewhere (one each for ESCAP, ECLAC, ECA and UNCHS). **These** four posts are non-recurring ones intended to provide a "transition period" for developing evaluation techniques and ensuring their use and feedback, after which existing staff in **these** units will carry out the functions on a self-evaluation basis. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), in its 1985 report **7/**, expressed some concern that, in the light of the establishment of the CEU, there was an "apparent proliferation of evaluation units in the Secretariat". However, **Secretariat** officials informed the Committee that, except for the CEU, it was intended that other **units** would be temporary.

24. These latest developments only increase the uncertainty about the future structure and operations of the eventual United Nations evaluation system. Three **major** and interrelated ambiguities should be mentioned. First, the Regulations adopted by the General Assembly in 1982 state that they aim "**to** subject all **programmes** of the Organisation to periodic and thorough reviews" and that they govern "evaluation of all activities undertaken by the United Nations, irrespective of their source of financing". However, Regulation 6.2 calls for evaluation of "**all** activities programmed", and Secretariat officials

explain that this means regular budget activities. This apparently exempts the dominant extrabudgetary activities (more than 60 per cent of United Nations total estimated expenditures for 1984-85, according to ACC statistics) from evaluation scrutiny.

25. Second, the 1983 and 1984 Secretary-General's reports and the draft Evaluation Manual state variously that United Nations entities "may", "might", or "could" apply basic evaluation steps and activities, thereby suggesting that evaluation is an optional or permissive function for each entity to consider rather than a required, integral management process for all activities. This impression is furthered by the very uneven patterns of evaluation staffing proposed for 1986-1987. The programme management needs of the five regional commissions, for example, are of course not synonymous. But it is not clear why one should have regular budget posts for evaluation (ECWA), another a mix of extrabudgetary and temporary posts (ESCAP), two others a single "transitional" post (EGA and ECLAC), and the fifth no evaluation posts at all (ECE).

26. Third, although the General Assembly has twice called on the Secretary-General (resolutions 36/228B and 38/227A) to develop "a timetable for the adequate establishment of [evaluation] units in all departments" and has endorsed his search for permanent solutions (resolution 39/238), the Secretariat has now indicated that evaluation units will be temporary except for the small CEO. It may well not be feasible to have small evaluation units in every entity, but the newly proposed strategy seems to be a sharp policy reversal. It calls into question the fate of those entities with evaluation units and systems already established and in use (such as DPI, DTCD, UNEP, ITC, UNHCR, and UNFDAC) or those which are just establishing systems (such as UNCTAD or UNDRO). In addition, JIU has already expressed concern in recent reports about the ability of small, centralized United Nations management units in New York - such as the CEU - to provide responsive, effective services and support to the ongoing operating programmes of the regional commissions and other offices and field locations around the world.

27. The Inspector believes that the former DIESA evaluation unit had made good recent progress towards fulfilling its evaluation leadership and system development tasks in the economic and social sectors, despite a heavy workload. Now, however, as the CEU, it must take on responsibility for all other United Nations sectors as well, which will require extensive additional methodological, developmental, support and oversight work as well as a doubling of its in-depth evaluation workload (central units system-wide now spend, on average, almost half their time doing in-depth evaluations). The apparent policy shift away from departmental evaluation units to reliance on the CEU will add even more work. The very important and time-consuming tasks of establishing and maintaining a training programme, built-in self-evaluation, design improvement efforts, and evaluation feedback and reporting systems have scarcely begun, and the CEU will also have a critical ongoing role to ensure smooth evaluation system operation and quality control throughout the United Nations.

28. The 1981 and 1985 JIU evaluation overview reports stress that initial system design and installation is an important step, but that it is the subsequent continuing workload required to implement the system that can overwhelm small central evaluation units and undermine system quality. JIU/REP/85/11 indicates (Chapter II.B and Annex I table) that 23 organizations of the system presently have on average only one professional central evaluation unit post for every 350 professional staff and for each US\$ 190 million in biennial expenditures. The eight United Nations entities discussed in the following sections (and including total UNDP programme expenditures) fare somewhat better: the ratios are 1:174 staff and 1: \$200 million respectively. For the rest of the United Nations, however, the current CEU staffing yields ratios of only 1:1,310 staff and 1: \$735 million. If the CEU resources would merely be raised to match the modest average ratios system-wide, it should have about 15 professional staff, not four. There is no single "right" level, but these average

/...



ration do raise doubts that the CEU as presently staffed can support and oversee an effective United Nations evaluation system.

29. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT : The United Nations has made further progress in recent years to improve in-depth evaluations for CPC, establish integrated monitoring and evaluation regulations and rules, and design a self-evaluation system. Despite a full decade of discussions, however, (as chronicled in the 1977, 1981 and this JIU report) and repeated expressions of concern by the General Assembly and the CPC, it is still locked into the initial phase of evaluation system definition, basic methodological development, and determination of staffing needs. The United Nations has fallen even further behind most other organizations of the system - which are now actively using, refining, and expanding their basic systems - than it was in 1981. The United Nations "integrated management" concept has not yet been implemented, because programme activities are still not systematically evaluated to determine the results obtained in order to improve future operations and decision-making.

30. Recommendation for the United Nations: The Secretary-General and the Programme Planning and Budgeting Board should give all possible support to the central monitoring and evaluation units to now move ahead to install and effectively use monitoring and evaluation throughout the Organization. Three major tasks already requested by the General Assembly and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination during 1981-1984 should receive priority attention.

(a) The report which the Central Evaluation Unit is to prepare for the General Assembly in 1986 on progress in strengthening evaluation systems and units should include a complete inventory of every entity of the United Nations to fully define and clarify United Nations evaluation system scope, coverage, and further planned development. The report should state (i) which entities are not included in the system and why, and what evaluation activities, if any, they have; (ii) which are included and have their own evaluation staffing, and the specific present and future nature of this staffing; and (iii) which are included but will be supported by the CEU or another unit, and how their support will be specifically provided. Particular attention should be given to the evaluation needs of the five regional economic commissions, as well as due regard to the evaluation staffing, systems and procedures already established and in use in most larger entities (see summaries II through IX following) and in a few smaller ones.

(b) The results of this inventory should clarify the extent to which other United Nations evaluation units can assist the CEU and the full scope of the CEU's responsibilities. The CEU responsibilities and tasks (as called for by General Assembly resolution 36/228B, paragraph 1; the report of CPC on its twenty-third session, paragraphs 189-190 and 192; and the Regulations and Rules, Article 6) should then be carefully assessed to determine, in specific work-month terms, the staffing and other resources required to allow the CEU to properly carry out its full set of evaluation system development, management, support and quality control functions,

(c) The Central Monitoring Unit should develop systematic data flows to provide much more up-to-date status information on actual programme delivery and modifications throughout the Organization. This system should be harmonized with the self-evaluation system to best maximize overall performance and results feedback and reporting, while minimizing insofar as possible reporting burdens, costs and overlap.

## II. UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (UNICEF)

31. 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 programme.

32. The 1981 JIU evaluation status report found that UNICEF was concentrating on development of a decentralized planning and programming process, which would lay a base for gradual integration of participative evaluation processes adapted to a developing country context at the "grassroots" level. JIU observed that this field-level participative focus was a challenging one and could lead to significant innovative approaches to sub-national programming, information, and monitoring and evaluation activities.

33. In 1982 and again in 1983 UNICEF issued revised internal guidance on the strengthening of programme monitoring and evaluation, in the light of the increased emphasis placed on this topic by the Executive Board, the JIU, the external auditors, and contributors concerned with improved accountability for scarce resources provided. The new guidance stressed specific actions to improve the planning, management, and use of evaluations supported by UNICEF, and in particular the need for clear, well considered plans for evaluation within each country programme.

34. UNICEF evaluation responsibilities reflect its decentralized operations, in which more than 80 per cent of the professional staff are located in the field. A Planning and Evaluation Section at headquarters with four professional staff is responsible for supporting a very select number of evaluations, system development and training, and monitoring of overall evaluation activities. However, in line with the country programming approach, evaluation is initiated and implemented at the country level. Ten to 15 posts in regional and country offices are designated exclusively for monitoring and evaluation, another 15-20 posts have similar but partial responsibilities, and most programme officers' job descriptions include some evaluation responsibilities.

35. UNICEF evaluation patterns presently include about 100 to 150 individual project evaluations annually, plus programme implementation reviews which are conducted for 70 to 80 of the 108 UNICEF country programmes. UNICEF has also begun a series of policy reviews, global thematic evaluations, and programme evaluations in recent years, using its own resources or collaborating with contributor governments and institutes, other United Nations system agencies, and external consultants. Most UNICEF evaluations, as a matter of basic programming policy, are done in collaboration with and in support of host governments. Further efforts are underway to help strengthen management capacities at the national and sub-national levels in simple, flexible and effective ways.

36. The programme, monitoring and evaluation sections of the UNICEF Field Manual are being revised and updated, and will include greater emphasis on performance measurement. Three regional meetings held in 1984 included workshops on monitoring and evaluation, and the strong former training emphasis on programme and project preparation has now shifted to programme evaluation. In addition, efforts are underway to improve evaluation feedback to field staff, governing bodies and top management through the clustering of evaluation lessons learned by themes, better use of evaluation experience from outside UNICEF, a new Programme Information Monitoring System, and development of a computerized project evaluation memory bank,

37. UNICEF has also continued its programme development efforts. During the 1982-1984 period reports to the Executive Board have analyzed programme co-operation and collaboration at the country, sub-national and local levels; alternative programming approaches in differing country categories; and programme strategies,

frameworks, operational challenges and activities by UNICEF region. A major new UNICEF initiative is the Child Survival and Development Revolution, which will require additional monitoring of national child and infant mortality indicators and the development of new programme strategies, information and skills.

38. In February 1984 UNICEF prepared a comprehensive overview of its evaluation activities for the Executive Board. The report reviewed monitoring and evaluation policies, development, organisational responsibilities, use in the programming cycle, current issues, and specific steps being taken to improve evaluation capacity ~~8/~~. The Executive Board gave strong support to the policy directions laid out in the report, especially those concerning the country-based approach to evaluation, flexibility in approaches, the use of cost-effectiveness analyses in evaluation, community participation wherever possible, and the use of monitoring and evaluation as a basic tool.

39. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNICEF has revised and strengthened its evaluation systems, with particular attention to integrating evaluation into the programming cycle, adding policy and thematic evaluation studies, developing new processes to improve feedback, and further efforts to utilize innovative and appropriate monitoring and evaluation approaches with governments at the "grassroots" and country levels. The continuing challenge will be to steadily improve the coverage and quality of these evaluation activities and ensure their effective use to improve the projects and programmes which UNICEF supports,

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

40. UNCHS was established to service the Commission on Human Settlements and provide a focal point for action, co-ordination and evaluation of human settlements activities in the United Nations system. UNCHS is the executing agency for technical co-operation projects in the field of human settlements. As such, it executes projects financed by UNDP, other agencies, funds in trust and the Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation, which is an integral part of the agency.

41. In 1978 UNCHS began a gradual, pragmatic process to develop monitoring and evaluation activities and feedback mechanisms, concentrating in particular on a Project Management System in its Technical Co-operation Division. These actions represented positive steps to develop a practical system to meet UNCHS operational needs, but the 1981 JIU status report recommended that a full-time monitoring and evaluation officer be assigned to develop and expand the basic system instead of the existing part-time staff responsibility.

42. UNCHS has continued to gradually expand its evaluation activities. Perhaps the most significant action occurred in June 1984 when a post of Senior Evaluation Officer was established through resource redeployment, located in the Office of the Executive Director and functioning in collaboration with a part-time junior professional and a steering committee of managers from various UNCHS units. The steering committee reflects a concerted effort by UNCHS to develop and implement an integrated programme of research, training, technical co-operation and information, with firm linkages among various sections and divisions of the Centre,

43. Since 1980, UNCHS field projects have been subject to built-in evaluation using guidelines which focused on sound project design and statements of objectives. In 1981 these criteria were extended to research and development projects, and it is planned to eventually extend them to all UNCHS activities. UNCHS believes that these processes have already led to definite improvement in on-going activities through better definitions of objectives, work programme design, and subsequent monitoring. Methodologies for in-depth evaluations of technical co-operation projects were developed and tested during 1983 with selected projects to be evaluated during 1984-85. UNCHS is now adopting the

UNDP evaluation guidelines for all its field projects, and certain sub-programmes will also be evaluated in-depth in the future. In addition, UNCHS has conducted joint evaluations with the World Bank, UNDP, and WFP.

44. The strengthened evaluation staffing from mid-1984, especially if it continues in the 1986-87 budgetary period, will allow new efforts in evaluation system development. Present methodologies will be reviewed and expanded into operational instructions for all sections of UNCHS. While there is still no staff training in evaluation, staff counselling and informal training will receive more emphasis, as will the conduct of specific evaluations. Documentation to integrate evaluation into the management decision-making process is being developed, evaluation guidelines will be prepared as a part of the UNCHS Operations Handbook, and internal and external evaluation reporting will be standardized as part of the process.

45. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNCHS has continued to gradually develop various aspects of the monitoring and evaluation framework introduced in 1980. The recent appointment of a Senior Evaluation Officer and establishment of a steering committee should allow the Centre to move at a somewhat more rapid pace from overall evaluation system introduction to its refinement and effective use to improve UNCHS project and programme performance.

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

46. UNCTAD's main responsibilities include the promotion of international trade, particularly with a view to accelerating economic development, formulation of principles and policies on international trade and related problems of economic development, 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 bi-annually between Conference sessions, has six main committees and one special committee on preferences, as well as various inter-governmental and expert groups.

47. The 1981 JIU status report recommended that UNCTAD consider developing an internal evaluation system, as part of the on-going discussions in the Trade and Development Board on rationalising UNCTAD's machinery, in order to strengthen programme management and enable UNCTAD inter-governmental bodies to better assess results. In 1982 a United Nations evaluation officer from DIESA prepared a report proposing an UNCTAD system for evaluation of regular programme activities. The report gave particular attention to evaluation of policy and technical information, the results of analytic research, and substantive support of inter-governmental negotiations, and to the need for a pragmatic and gradual approach to evaluation system development. Following further discussion, and in light of General Assembly requests to strengthen United Nations evaluation units and systems, the Secretary-General of UNCTAD appointed a team of consultants in early 1984 to elaborate an evaluation system.

48. The consultants' report 9/ analyzed approaches being taken in the United Nations system as they apply to UNCTAD, existing evaluation-related activities within UNCTAD, and the feasibility of systematically and comprehensively applying evaluation activities to the various types of programme activities which UNCTAD undertakes. The consultants recommended that the Secretary-General gradually establish a comprehensive system of management-oriented evaluation to enhance the programme management cycle in UNCTAD, within the framework of the programme budget and relying basically on a combination of internal, decentralized self-evaluation and independent evaluation. They also recommended that a small Central evaluation focal point be established as a catalyst and co-ordinator of

/...

this system, and that the Secretary-General consider inviting Member States to examine whether and how policy-oriented evaluation might be made a more systematic and explicit function of UNCTAD's inter-governmental bodies.

49. The Secretary-General of UNCTAD announced in August 1984 that he had decided to set up a special unit in his Office and make arrangements at division and programme levels, through redeployment of existing resources, to implement a system of management-oriented evaluation along the lines set out in the consultants' report.

50. A small Programme Co-ordination and Evaluation Unit with three professional staff was established in February 1985 10/. The initial evaluation work plan of the Unit will concentrate on **elaborating an** UNCTAD evaluation plan, aiding evaluations by programme managers, undertaking and supporting other evaluations as appropriate, building expertise on evaluation methodology relevant to UNCTAD's work, helping to establish and implement an integrated documents system, and assisting in monitoring the implementation of the work programme. The evaluation system will basically rely on a combination of **self-** and independent evaluation for internal management use, while keeping the main committees and the Trade and Development Board informed of evaluation coverage, results and follow-up through periodic summary reports. The Secretariat evaluation system is thus intended to complement any policy-oriented evaluation undertaken by the competent UNCTAD inter-governmental bodies.

51. In addition to evaluation, the new Unit has been entrusted with responsibilities relating to planning, programming, monitoring, documents planning and co-ordination. It is also responsible for co-ordinating the substantive servicing of the Working Party on the Medium-term Plan and the Programme Budget. UNCTAD officials have stated that the staff will approach these functions as part of an integrated management process. Consequently, the specific workload involved in evaluation activities and support cannot be determined precisely. An internal **study** has been made of the use of consultants, methodological material with emphasis on practical applications is being developed, and evaluation training requirements for UNCTAD are being considered. An evaluation plan for 1986 has been prepared 11/. It provides for 10 self-evaluation studies, involving eight subprogrammes and two programmes without subprogrammes, which are to be completed in time for the preparation of the next United Nations medium-term plan.

52. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Following several years of discussion, the 1984 consultants' report and the Secretary-General's decision provide a good foundation **for** the gradual but steady development of a sound internal evaluation system and appropriate evaluation techniques to meet the needs of UNCTAD programme managers and inter-governmental bodies. Making this system a reality, however, will place heavy responsibilities on the small focal point unit to establish and follow through on specific evaluation plans, methodologies, and actions. It will also require continuing top management and inter-governmental body support and review of the progress made.

## V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTRE UNCTAD/GATT (ITC)

53. ITC, jointly operated by UNCTAD and GATT, is the focal point for all United Nations technical assistance activities in trade promotion. The Centre assists developing countries in improving their international trade performance through export expansion and diversification and increased economy and efficiency in import procurement. A Joint Advisory Group (**JAG**) meets annually to review ITC activities and formulate recommendations to governing bodies on the future ITC work programme.

54. Although it is a small **organization**, ITC is one of the most experienced in evaluation, having established a project evaluation **system** in 1975. In addition,

/...

ITC relies primarily on a "peer group" or "team" approach rather than the self-evaluation or independent central evaluation used by most other agencies. The systems development challenge for ITC during the past several years, as the 1981 JIU status report observed, has been to expand its evaluation system from projects to the rest of the ITC programme; improve linkages, feedback and follow-up in the project and programme management cycle; and in general ensure the effectiveness of the evaluation process within ITC trade promotion work.

55. ITC evaluation focal point responsibilities, formerly in a small Evaluation Section, are now vested in a Senior Officer on Evaluation in the Office of the Executive Director. Each year ITC prepares a schedule providing for about 12 in-depth evaluations of larger projects. One-third are led by the evaluation officer, the rest by other senior ITC officers who have not been directly associated with the particular project. Representatives of the financing agencies and recipient governments participate in most of these evaluation missions. Following the mission, a report is issued to the participating parties and a debriefing given to the Executive Director and concerned staff. An annual synthesis of evaluation conclusions has been presented to ITC staff development meetings for discussion for the past several years, and the same general analysis is presented to the JAG in the ITC annual report 12/.

56. In 1981 ITC also introduced a programme evaluation system. Each year the JAG selects one of ITC's nine programmes for evaluation by an independent consultant, who submits an in-depth report directly to the JAG analyzing programme scope, resources, implementation, achievements and impact and providing recommendations for future programme development 13/. It appears that these reports have been well received and have provided the JAG with a significant method for discussing and advising on policy questions as well as programme matters.

57. In 1981-1982 an ITC task force reviewed means of improving the ITC programming process, which led to revised policies and rules for project identification and design. During 1984, work began to develop an integrated system of project design, monitoring and evaluation, to be contained in a revised ITC Project Management Manual which would be extended to all ITC projects whatever their source of financing. The new Manual would also provide the basis for an ITC staff training programme in design and evaluation (ITC presently relies on the ILO design and evaluation training courses). Another ITC working group was established in mid-1986 to gradually develop a computerised management information system with initial emphasis on a project monitoring sub-system, and a computerized report monitoring system was recently created as an "institutional memory bank" for evaluation and other reports. In addition, ITC has a mandate to begin evaluation training for government trade promotion officials if funding can be arranged.

58. Despite its decade of evaluation experience, the funding for evaluation activities in ITC has always been on an essentially temporary basis. The evaluation officer is a staff member, but there is no specific budget for evaluation and formal terms of reference have not been established for the evaluation post. The funding for much of the project evaluation work over the years, and for all the annual programme evaluations, has come from extra-budgetary contributions.

59. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The established ITC project evaluation system has now been supplemented by a programme evaluation process. The current initiatives to develop an integrated design, monitoring and evaluation system, link it with computerised systems, and develop appropriate training for ITC staff and government officials are important steps to further enhance the quality and value of the evaluation system to ITC management and the JAG. Never **theless**, evaluation is still not firmly **institutionalized** in ITC because of the basic reliance on extra-budgetary funding.

60. Recommendation for the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT The terms of reference of the Evaluation Officer should be formally established and regular budget funding provided for the evaluation function, in order to ensure that the solid evaluation progress which ITC has made will be maintained and to support the important initiatives **to** further **strengthen** evaluation system quality and usefulness.

## VI. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)

61. UNDP assists over 150 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. UNDP operates 115 field offices around the world and finances some 5,500 projects, which are executed by UNDP and 27 executing agencies, primarily other **organiza-**tions of the United Nations system. A distinguishing feature of the UNDP monitoring, evaluation and reporting system is that it must rely on the close co-operation of executing agencies and recipient governments in setting standards and organizing the evaluation work proper. The Administrator of UNDP is responsible to the Governing Council, which reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC.

62. The 1981 JIU status report observed that UNDP's long established internal evaluation system had made recent progress in some areas, but that its structure and processes had also become rather unclear. JIU recommended that full-time evaluation staff be assigned to further develop, s'trengthen and oversee an effective system throughout UNDP. In 1982 the Administrator initiated a study of further improvements, in the light of the resurgence of interest in evaluation of development assistance in governing bodies and organizations of the United Nations system. Both UNDP and the JIU prepared reports on the status, organizational arrangements, and proposed improvements in the evaluation system, which were in general agreement on areas of emphasis and actions needed **14/ 15/.**

63. In October 1983, the Administrator, with Governing Council endorsement, established a small Central Evaluation Office (CEO) in the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation **to** strengthen evaluation. Three professional staff posts and consultant resources were provided, but it was **recognized** that full implementation of the CEO functions would eventually require six professional staff and a director. The CEO has overall responsibility for **providing** the Administrator and the Governing Council with a systematic and independent assessment of the results, effectiveness, and impact of the substantive activities of **UNDP.** **Its** specific functions are to develop monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures ; assist in internal evaluation feedback ; collaborate with other organizations **of** the system to **develop** a consistent, coherent, and agreed upon set of evaluation practices ; analyze and report on Programme effectiveness; and assist UNDP operational units to help developing countries enhance their capacities for evaluation. Eleven Evaluation Co-ordinators in the Regional Bureaux and operational units assist the Office in management and implementation of the evaluation system through Evaluation Plans, system monitoring, and other advisory, feedback and support functions. In each field office the deputy resident representative is normally the evaluation co-ordinator. BPPE Technical Advisers also assist and participate in specific evaluation studies.

64. The revised UNDP evaluation system depends on an integrated structure, linked to Country Programme Management Plans, which includes (a) monitoring of implementation, regular internal evaluations, and periodic tripartite reviews by government, UNDP, and executing agency representatives; (b) independent in-depth

project evaluations ; (c) selective ex post evaluations; (d) thematic evaluations of broader topics; and (e) country, intercountry (and perhaps in future substantive headquarters) programme evaluations. Although most of **these** processes are applied only to larger projects for cost-effectiveness reasons, this **still** represents a substantial volume of activity; some **2,400** internal evaluations, a somewhat greater number of tripartite reviews, and about **220** in-depth evaluations annually, plus evaluative reviews of all 115 country programmes twice during their five year span and selected thematic and ex post evaluation studies.

**65.** The priority work of the new CEO has been the revision of all existing UNDP monitoring , evaluation and reporting policies, procedures and practices (most of which were developed before **1974**) to ensure a fully functioning evaluation system. The CEO has worked with an Interbureau Working Group within UNDP and has held three meetings of an Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation **composed** of executing agency evaluation representatives. Draft revised procedures are now being tested in all UNDP-assisted projects, and an in-depth analysis of experience will be made in twelve **countries**. The trial period will end in May 1986, and will be followed by a collaborative assessment of experience and revision before the final procedures are issued.

**66.** Since 1978 UNDP and its collaborating agencies and governments have completed 14 thematic evaluations, with **several others** underway for the 1984-86 period. These studies appear to have been well received and to have improved steadily in quality **16/**. UNDP has recently established common procedures and detailed schedules to streamline implementation of these studies, but greater efforts are still needed to ensure effective feedback of their results into operations. The CEO is actively involved in thematic evaluations, and had to devote a considerable portion of its initial work to follow-up on a **UN/UNDP/UNIDO** evaluation of Manufactures Industries which was actively discussed in several governing bodies in 1983 and 1984.

**67.** The Administrator reported to the Governing Council in 1984 on actions taken to improve evaluation activities and policies **17/**, and on project results by region. However, as UNDP **recognizes**, much **remains to** be done by the CEO, even though the "evaluation network" in the regional bureaux, headquarters and field offices should help to substantially enhance overall evaluation system performance. The trial period for the new monitoring, reporting and evaluation procedures and the subsequent careful analysis of experience will require extensive support and oversight from the CEO. It is also very important that UNDP clarify and **standardize** its closely related procedures for project design. In addition, the new procedures will require revised and extensive evaluation training, beginning with several new seminars on project formulation, design and evaluation in 1985, which must reach the professional field staff at the country level who fill the key operational roles in the **decentralized** UNDP structure.

**68.** UNDP made an initial review of project evaluation quality in 1983, but "quality control" and oversight of compliance will be important continuing functions of the CEO and the "network": the External Auditors of the United Nations, the JIU, and UNDP itself have all cited problems in recent years in implementing required monitoring and evaluation activities. In addition, evaluation analysis and reporting requires continuous attention to ensure effective internal feedback links to operations and to meet the needs of the normal Governing Council agenda item on evaluation. Last but far from least, in 1983 the General Assembly emphasized the important role of the United Nations system in supporting the development of the evaluation capacities of governments. UNDP has a pivotal role to play in this **process**. Thus far it has worked with the Regional Bureaux to develop appropriate technical assistance, issued a Directory of Central Evaluation Authorities, and encouraged initial inter-agency efforts.

**69.** SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The UNDP tripartite evaluation system is a very important one in the **United Nations** system, not only in terms of the effectiveness of the thousands of UNDP-assisted projects and of its worldwide field



office operations, but also in terms of its collaborative relationships with the evaluation systems of its executing agencies and in helping develop those of governments (as discussed further in the accompanying report, JIU/REP/85/11). UNDP has made substantial progress in the past two years to update and revise its internal evaluation policies, procedures, and structures. However, the work required now to fully implement this revised system and firmly integrate it into operation<sup>6</sup> will be a critical phase. The many tasks outlined above place heavy burdens on the present partial staffing of the UNDP Central Evaluation Office, which cannot yet effectively fulfil the essential system management functions which JIU stressed in its 1983 report on the UNDP evaluation system.

**70. Recommendation for the United Nations Development Programme** In order to fully and effectively implement its revised internal evaluation system, UNDP should complete the staffing of its Central Evaluation Office as envisioned at the time the Office was established. The additional four professional staff would help significantly to achieve the desired strengthening of the UNDP evaluation system, enhance UNDP tripartite evaluation work with its executing agencies and with developing country governments, and provide a central evaluation unit staffing level and system management capacity much more commensurate with its tasks and in line with that found in other large United Nations system agencies.

## VII. UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)

**71.** UNEP was created in 1972 to monitor the global environment and to plot courses of development that would maximize growth while sustaining the balance of resources underlying that growth. Its Governing Council (which met annually until 1985 and will decide on its periodicity in 1987) and a small secretariat serve as focal points for environmental action in the United Nations system. A voluntary Environment Fund provides additional financing in the environmental activities. The programme of UNEP is thus integrated with the programmes which the other system agencies have in the environmental field, under a system-wide medium-term environment programme. Although UNEP has a small number of projects which it executes directly, its primary emphasis is on its catalytic and co-ordinative functions.

**72.** The 1981 JIU status report observed that the Governing Council had shown considerable interest in evaluation. In 1977 it stressed the need for project and programme evaluation and more reporting on the type of evaluation used and on progress and results achieved. In response, UNEP had developed a variety of evaluation activities which had been favourably noted elsewhere in the system. JIU expressed concern, however, that UNEP evaluation efforts appeared to be losing momentum, particularly due to the difficulty in further developing its complex system-wide programming responsibilities and its programme management processes. JIU recommended that UNEP strengthen its evaluation unit in order to maintain and further develop evaluation as an integral, useful feedback mechanism.

**73.** During the past few years the Governing Council has continued to state its support for evaluation and to encourage further strengthening of evaluation activities, most recently in 1983. During the 1980-84 period, about 20 in-depth project and programme evaluations were undertaken, a Joint evaluation was made with UNESCO, four evaluation seminars were conducted in UNEP by evaluation specialists from other system agencies, and internal and external evaluation reporting have continued.

**74.** Nevertheless, overall evaluation activity in UNEP has declined. The Fund Policies and Evaluation Section (FPE), located in the Fund but reporting directly to the Deputy Executive Director on all evaluation matters, steadily lost staff. Five professional posts were designated for the section, but staffing fell from three in 1980 to two in 1981 to one in 1982 and finally to a vacant post from

May 1984 to March 1985. In part, this reflects very tight overall resource constraints : the Governing Council has repeatedly stressed the need to reduce expenditures and to exercise tight control over programme and programme support **costs**. It also reflects a LJNEP effort to reform and streamline its information and **publications** programme to maximize cost-effectiveness. The FPE Section was formerly responsible for preparing a bi-monthly Report to Governments which included summary information on evaluation reports, but this report was **discontinued** in 1984 at the request of the Governing Council. A new Evaluation Section, with two professional staff posts, is now responsible for preparing an annual evaluation report 18/.

75. The new Evaluation Section expects to concentrate more on using the results of evaluations, to undertake improvement of project and eventually programme design, and to reassess possibilities for developing more specific evaluation methodologies for use in UNEP. Although the future extent of evaluation activities will depend on the levels of voluntary contributions, UNEP feels that evaluation efforts have continued to bring significant progress in improving the programme and helping to reorient and streamline its activities.

76. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT : A combination of events has made it difficult to reinvigorate the UNEP evaluation system during the past few years, but the establishment of a new Evaluation Section and officer permit a new beginning. Severe funding constraints must be balanced with recognition of the integral role which evaluation should play, not only to help achieve the pragmatic programme actions and cost-effectiveness which the Governing Council has sought, but also to provide an important tool in the preparation and subsequent follow-up actions on the Environmental Perspective to the Year 2000 and Beyond which the General Assembly requested of UNEP in 1983 in resolution 38/161.

77. Recommendation for the United Nations Environment Programme The Governing Council and UNEP top management should provide all possible support to the work of the new Evaluation Section to help evaluation in UNEP regain its earlier momentum, develop appropriate methodologies to support UNEP's complex systemwide programming responsibilities, and permit full integration of evaluation into overall UNEP project and programme management processes.

#### VIII. UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (UNFPA)

78. UNFPA is a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly whose purpose is to assist developing countries in solving their population problems. It works closely with governments and regional groups and, as a funding agency, relies on the United Nations, ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, UNICEF and non-governmental **organizations** to execute its projects in those areas where they have special expertise. The Governing Council of UNBP serves as its governing body.

79. The 1981 JIU status report observed that evaluation appeared to be a **well-established**, useful and understood process in UNFPA, but that there was also a demand from staff, top **management**, and the Governing Council for greater evaluation feedback through an increase in the number and speed of evaluation studies. JIU recommended that UNFPA further strengthen its project design processes and then consider developing a built-in self-evaluation system to supplement the effective activities of its central Evaluation Branch.

80. In 1984, at the request of the Governing Council, UNFPA prepared reports on its programming procedures and evaluation activities. The first report 19/ reviewed evolution, status, and trends in the programming system, including monitoring and evaluation to provide (a) systematic feedback for corrective action, (b) accountability for resources to the Governing Council, and (c) a broad base of knowledge for improving future projects. The report stated that

a high-priority, systematic review had been underway for several years to revise and improve these processes, including actions to **make** better use of the large **amount of** monitoring and evaluation information which exists.

81. The second report 20/ reviewed **the** results of **UNFPA's** programme of independent, in-depth evaluations of country and inter-country programmes and projects. It discussed actions taken to streamline evaluation reporting to provide more timely inputs *to* decision-making, and a survey of past evaluations which showed that evaluation results were being widely used by governments, executing agencies, and UNFPA for programming purposes and revision and improvement of activities. UNFPA had also decided to gradually develop basic plans for built-in **self-evaluation** in all new projects in order to further improve project **design**, implementation, and evaluation feedback and to contribute to governmental **self-reliance**. Future evaluation plans included the establishment of a more systematic follow-up on **use** of evaluation results in projects, substantive sectors, and policy-making; the development of training activities for built-in self-evaluation; and further refinement of the methodologies for independent evaluation. The Governing Body endorsed these initiatives, as well as the need for training in evaluation at all levels.

82. The Evaluation Branch, **located** in the Policy and Evaluation Division, has six professional staff. Working with consultants, they presently spend most of their **time** conducting independent in-depth evaluations: in 1984, eight such evaluations were made covering 34 of the 1,831 UNFPA-assisted projects world-wide. In addition, during 1983-84 the Branch conducted two country programme evaluations, two evaluations of clusters of projects, two evaluations of regional projects) and three theme evaluations on the role of women. Guidelines and procedures for independent, in-depth evaluation were prepared in 1982, tested and revised, and issued in 1984 21/.

83. The Evaluation Branch submits its evaluation reports and recommendations to an internal Policy Committee, composed of the Deputy and Assistant Executive Directors and all Division Chiefs, and then to the Executive Director. It also participates in a committee which appraises new projects, and prepares a report on evaluation every two years for **the** Governing Council. The Council has requested that the 1986 report assess the comparative results of past evaluations according to the major UNFPA work plan categories.

84. UNFPA monitoring activities continue to be based on project progress reports, **tripartite** project reviews, and annual country reviews while the existing UNFPA guidance *of* 1978 on project formulation and monitoring is being reviewed. The responsibilities and procedures for establishing built-in self-evaluation are still being worked out by an internal task force, and new processes for **analyzing** evaluation findings and patterns for broader policy and planning purposes are also under development. Although some ad hoc training in project design, use of indicators and evaluation has occurred, there is still no regular training programme in evaluation for UNFPA staff.

85. **SUMMARY ASSESSMENT** : UNFPA has further improved the coverage, feedback, and usefulness of the independent, **in-dept**, evaluation work done by its Evaluation Branch. However, despite a commitment to strengthen project design and monitoring **and introduce** built-in self-evaluation and related training in the overall UNFPA programming system, progress in these areas has **been** rather slow. The UNFPA internal task force needs now to follow through with specific steps and actions to **develop**, install and effectively **use** these new or revised processes.

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

86. UNHCR was established in 1951 to provide international protection to refugees and to seek durable solutions to refugee problems. The initial UNHCR role was mainly a non-operational one of refugee protection. **In recent years, however, it** has had to develop extensive material assistance programmes, at the request of the General Assembly and the governments concerned, to meet increasing refugee needs and carry out special operations benefiting displaced persons. As a result, expenditures have grown very rapidly, from about \$10 million in 1975 to about \$400 million estimated for 1984, and UNHCR now operates nearly 100 field offices worldwide. An Executive Committee meets at least annually to determine UNHCR policies and oversee programmes, and UNHCR also reports annually to the General Assembly through ECOSOC.

87. UNHCR has made a great deal of progress in establishing and using an internal evaluation system since the 1981 JIU status report recommended the establishment of a systematic evaluation process based on the new UNHCR Project Management System (PMS). The system emphasizes complementary self- and in-depth evaluation of the dominant assistance activities, to provide managers, the Executive Committee, and donor governments with information on programme and project results. A small Evaluation Unit, established in late 1980 and now located in the Office of the Director of the Assistance Division, is responsible for conducting most in-depth evaluations, as well as for developing and managing the evaluation system. However, the two professional staff of the Unit are in "L" posts, a category usually intended for temporary situations rather than for the specialized (and hopefully permanent) programme support role which they fulfil as the UNHCR evaluation officers.

88. Self-evaluation of projects was introduced in 1981 as a basic component of the PMS. The evaluations are carried out by field staff at year-end and upon project completion, with small projects grouped together in a single report and about 600 reports prepared each year. Evaluation workshops and other training have now been held for some 50 per cent of UNHCR professional staff. The Evaluation Unit prepares annual reports for each Branch Office giving specific steps to improve self-evaluation quality, and the Unit is also considering the feasibility of synthesizing lessons learned from self-evaluation to determine key factors bearing on project success or failure.

89. About six to eight in-depth evaluations are also done each year by a team led by an evaluation officer, with another four done by consultants or by in-house technical specialists. An annual work plan developed on a consultative basis focuses on larger projects, groups of projects or programmes (thus providing evaluation coverage of up to 30 per cent of total annual UNHCR expenditure). The Evaluation Unit follows up with Regional Bureaux to ensure implementation of key recommendations which have been accepted, periodically disseminates key lessons learned to concerned field and headquarters staff, incorporates these lessons into UNHCR's Handbook for Emergencies, and periodically reports on evaluation status to senior management. An annual report on evaluation activities is also made to a sub-committee of the UNHCR Executive Committee 22/.

90. Acceptance of and requests for evaluation are increasing as UNHCR staff become more familiar with the process and aware of its benefits. Although a great deal of support and calls for continued evaluation strengthening have come from the Executive Committee, it appears that this increased demand for evaluation has been primarily the result of evaluation success in bringing about identifiable programme changes, corrective actions, and cost savings. The self-evaluation and feedback system is already beginning to play an important role in these improvements, as noted in a recent JIU report on the role of UNHCR in South-East Asia (JIU/REP/84/15). However, the most significant factor seems to have been the quality of the in-depth evaluation studies produced by the small Evaluation Unit.

91. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT : During the past four years, UNHCR has made **solid** progress in developing an internal evaluation system and establishing its value in concrete ways. It has combined the establishment and operation of a **self-evaluation** system with a programme of in-depth evaluations, which in turn have increased requests for evaluation. To maintain this progress, UNHCR needs to clarify the status of the staff in its Evaluation Unit, and continue to strengthen internal evaluation feedback and follow-up processes to ensure that evaluation findings are effectively applied to UNHCR assistance programmes worldwide.

92. Recommendation for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees UNHCR should convert the two professional posts in its Evaluation Unit to permanent posts. It should also make further efforts to ensure integration of the evaluation system into the UNHCR decision-making process, in order to consolidate and continue the solid evaluation progress made during the past four years.

#### **X. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)**

93. The basic purposes of **FAO** 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.

94. The basic purposes of the **FAO** internal evaluation system are to improve the relevance) effectiveness , and efficiency of all **FAO programmes** through **systematic**, in-depth assessment of the results of activities for **FAO** management, recipient governments, governing bodies and funding sources. Evaluation of the Regular Programme is made through a process of "auto-evaluation" by programme managers at various levels, combined with evaluation of specific programme areas and special topics made by the Evaluation Service or by independent consultants. Evaluation of the Field Programme is made through on-going or ex post evaluations of programmes and projects with recipient governments, UNDP, and funding sources, primarily through some 50 in-depth evaluations of large-scale technical co-operation projects made each year by independent missions. While evaluation is thus a **decentralized** process involving almost all units, the Evaluation Service in the Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation participates in many of the evaluation activities and serves as a focal point with responsibility for overall evaluation system co-ordination, support, and oversight.

95. The **FAO** evaluation system has existed since 1968, but efforts to steadily refine and strengthen it have continued in several major areas beyond those already cited in the 1981 JIU status report. One important area has been the improvement of internal monitoring and feedback processes. The auto-evaluation process established in 1979 has been supplemented by a system of annual work plans which are monitored through three implementation progress reports each year, review and analysis of auto-evaluation findings by the Evaluation Service, and a sharp increase in the number of programme components and special topics evaluated directly by the Evaluation Service.

96. A more systematic approach to monitoring and evaluation of **FAO's** many technical co-operation projects (some 2,500 in about 150 countries) is also being developed through the implementation of a field project management information system, and a requirement for the preparation of annual evaluation plans by operations units in conjunction with the Evaluation Service. The **Director-General** issued revised evaluation guidance in 1981 to consolidate and streamline the evaluation system 23/, which attached great importance to measures to ensure systematic and effective evaluation feedback to improve programme/project design and implementation in a more integrated way in all parts of **FAO**.

97. **FAO** has considerably increased its support to developing countries to improve their evaluation systems. Part of this activity relates to pilot studies and collaborative activities in about 50 countries to help develop and establish appropriate indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of national rural development programmes, as an outgrowth of the 1979 World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (**WCARRD**). **FAO** is also currently providing assistance in 13 countries in the design and operation of monitoring and evaluation systems at the project or national agriculture ministry level. Eight seminars/workshops specifically on monitoring and evaluation have been held in five countries, with another half-dozen planned for the 1984-85 period.

98. Additional actions have been taken to improve external evaluation reporting. The biennial Review of the Regular Programme report, begun in 1979, has evolved towards a special emphasis on selected in-depth reviews and special topics which cut across programmes 24/. The biennial Review of Field Programmes has also expanded its evaluative content 25/. A series of evaluative progress reports or reviews of special topics have been made or **summarized** for FAG Committees, and two joint evaluation studies with **UNDP** have been published with a third underway. These reports appear to have been well received, and to have been fairly extensively discussed in the Technical Committees of the Council. Demand for evaluation appears to be increasing, as evidenced by a recent request by the Programme Committee to review the research activities of the entire **FAO** Regular Programme, and requests for evaluations by donors who sponsor Trust Fund activities.

99. As these many new activities indicate, the responsibilities of the Evaluation Service for managing the evaluation system and conducting evaluations have increased considerably. The staff of the Service already spend about two-thirds of their time either performing evaluations or reporting on them to management and to the governing bodies. However, they are also engaged in other efforts to enhance the system: better monitoring of follow-up on individual project evaluation recommendations; recently revised guidelines for evaluation of technical co-operation activities 26/ and the development of guidelines for evaluation of training and other specific areas; planned **computerization** of project evaluation reports to facilitate analysis and syntheses for reporting; and adding evaluation elements to the **FAO** staff training courses in project preparation and project management. Since the eight professional staff posts in the Evaluation Service have not been increased since 1978 and consultant funds for Regular Programme evaluations are modest, this considerable expansion of activity has strained the ability of the Service to fulfil all its designated evaluation system functions. In January 1986, however, the Evaluation Service is to be strengthened through the addition of two posts: an Evaluation Officer and a Research Assistant

100. **SUMMARY ASSESSMENT:** The ambitious and comprehensive **FAO** evaluation system framework which **JIU** reported on in 1981 has now been filled out as **FAO** continues to expand evaluation coverage, refine and improve operation of the system, and integrate evaluation with other programme management and oversight processes. The steady progress in improving this system is shown by the greater use being made of evaluation findings and the increasing requests for evaluation reports.

#### XT. INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA)

101. The basic purpose of IAEA is to accelerate and enlarge the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The General Conference **meets** annually and the Board of Governors meets at least three times a year. In addition, IAEA has a high-level Scientific Advisory Group, standing advisory bodies, and many ad hoc expert committees and working groups .

102. The 1981 JIU status report found that IAEA had a healthy situation for evaluation systems development, with initiatives being taken in a number of key areas. JIU concluded that the challenge would be to gradually expand these efforts to all areas and integrate them with existing overnight processes, and recommended that IAEA follow through to build an integrated internal evaluation system.

103. The major subsequent development in IAEA has been the establishment of an internal evaluation system in the Department of Technical Co-operation. An evaluation officer post was established in 1980 and expanded in 1983 to an Evaluation Unit with two professional staff. Built-in self-evaluation reporting has been established for all of IAEA's 750 technical co-operation projects, using an evaluation Procedures Manual 27/. This is supplemented by "desk evaluation reviews" of performance in 50-75 projects each year, several in-depth field evaluations annually, sub-sector country evaluations, and evaluations of major administrative and support processes (four in 1984-85). These activities are intended to enhance the Agency's prior technical co-operation monitoring system through an increased emphasis on outputs, a new system of project interim and completion reports, on-going and terminal evaluations, and a systematic process of analysis and follow-up.

104. Internal evaluation reports are reviewed by the Evaluation Unit and departmental top managers, and annual reports on evaluation activities are submitted to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Committee of the Board and to the Board itself 28/. Staff training has begun for headquarters staff, as well as several regional workshops in evaluation and project design being held for national liaison officials during 1984-85. Despite the short-term use of consultants and cost-free experts, however, present staffing is not adequate to meet the specific requirement for evaluation activities - especially for in-depth evaluations - made of the Unit by internal management and the Board of Governors. As a result, one additional professional staff post is being requested for 1986 to partially replace the present consultant funding,

105. Evaluation activities in the Department of Safeguards have also continued to develop. The Evaluation Section established in 1978 was re-organized as the Division of Safeguards Evaluation in 1983 with 21 professional and 14 general service posts. The Division was given increased responsibilities for monitoring, evaluating, analyzing and reporting on the effectiveness of maintaining nuclear material accountability through the implementation of safeguards activities at specific nuclear facilities. Safeguards evaluation is thus a highly specialized and technical process which differs considerably in nature and terminology from evaluation activities discussed elsewhere in this report. The Board of Governors has often affirmed the importance of safeguards evaluation, and it appears that its continuing development and use has brought steady improvement in accountability for safeguards activities and in the maintenance and "transparency" of the overall safeguards system.

106. Evaluation activities in the two IAEA technical/research departments and the Department of Administration have advanced more slowly. "Focal point" evaluation officers were designated in the technical departments in 1980, but they presently spend only a very small part of their time on evaluation matters, and the departments still rely on an informal mix of review and assessment activities rather than any coherent evaluation system. An evaluation coordinator was also established in the Office of Internal Audit and Management Services in 1980, but significant progress has awaited basic programming changes. A new programme format was introduced in the 1984-85 IAEA programme and budget, which is expected to strengthen accountability to governing bodies, improve programme design, establish clearer programme priorities, and allow integration of evaluation activities into the planning, programming and budgeting cycle. IAEA officials stated that further progress is now being made to improve this format and to strengthen the general practical approach to programming and evaluation.

107. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: IAEA has made significant progress during the past few years in establishing and using an evaluation system for its technical co-operation activities, and further strengthening its safeguards evaluation work. The new programme budgeting approach should now enable IAEA to develop and establish systematic evaluation processes for its technical programmes as well.

108. Recommendation for the International Atomic Energy Agency IAEA should undertake the proposed strengthening of its technical co-operation Evaluation Unit through replacement of short-term consultant funds by new professional staff. This would help to sustain the considerable progress already made and ensure that the Unit could meet rapidly expanding evaluation requests in an effective way. With evaluation systems now successfully established to meet the particular needs of its safeguards and technical co-operation programmes, IAEA should also concentrate on developing and implementing a systematic evaluation process for other departments within its new programme budget approach, thereby extending evaluation IAEA-wide.

## XII. INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION (ICAO)

109. ICAO is primarily an inter-governmental regulatory organization in the field of international civil aviation. Its basic purposes are to study problems of international civil aviation, establish international standards and regulations for civil aviation, and foster the development and planning of international air transport, including technical assistance. Direction is provided by the Assembly which meets at least once every three years, and continuing operations are monitored by the Council which, with its six subsidiary bodies, meets regularly throughout the year.

110. Because the ICAO Council and its bodies meet on a permanent basis and regular programme activities are primarily regulatory, an extensive evaluation system does not seem needed in this area. However, in 1980 the Council decided that it would like more evaluative information on the Technical Assistance programme, and the 1981 JIU status report recommended that ICAO and other smaller specialized agencies consider adapting monitoring and evaluation techniques and approaches being used elsewhere in the United Nations system.

111. In 1982 the ICAO secretariat proposed and the Council approved the establishment of a Programme Evaluation Officer post in the Technical Assistance Bureau to initiate in-depth evaluations of representative projects by consultants to measure achievement of project objectives and assess their contribution to broader development objectives. Subsequently, however, ICAO decided to postpone this recruitment to consider the growing emphasis on built-in self-evaluation in other system organizations, and to await the decision of UNDP (which is by far the largest single financial source for ICAO projects with the rest coming from trust funds) as to revision of its requirements and procedures for project monitoring, evaluation and reporting. In addition, during the past few years the UNDP funds available to ICAO have decreased sharply, thus requiring careful scrutiny of any new programme initiatives.

112. Despite these complications, ICAO conducted 10 consultant missions during 1983 and 14 during 1984 to evaluate carefully-selected regional and country projects, with interim support provided by existing operational staff. This pattern of evaluations will be continued and reported on annually to the Council. In 1984 a consultant made an in-depth survey of technical co-operation evaluation systems used by other organizations of the system as a basis for building appropriate mechanisms for ICAO, which the Secretary-General also reported on to the Council 29 /.



113. In addition, ICAO has developed and put into use a Project Formulation Handbook based on UNDP guidance but specific to ICAO. It has updated its criteria governing the provision of technical assistance, which were approved by the Council in 1984; conducted staff seminars to enhance knowledge of technical assistance requirements and procedures for sound project design; and undertaken a substantive programme to improve and update documentation in both the regular and technical assistance programmes. It is also considering ways to improve cross-linkages and evaluation feedback between projects and between geographical areas, and to develop country strategies in the ICAO regional offices.

114. Further steps, such as development of ICAO's own evaluation procedures, evaluation unit functions, evaluation training, and additional reporting processes await the revision of the UNDP procedures. The Council has continued to show significant interest in evaluation, but has accepted the maintenance of present interim arrangements pending completion of the UNDP review.

115. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: ICAO has taken positive steps to update and strengthen its overall technical assistance criteria and management processes. Its establishment of regular evaluation studies and reporting, and an evaluation officer post (which will hopefully be filled in the near future), plus its survey of evaluation practices in other organizations, leave it well-prepared to further develop its own evaluation structure and procedures. As a subsequent step, ICAO might consider extending some of these evaluation procedures and techniques to appropriate parts of its regular programme.

### XIII. INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD)

116. IFAD began operations as a specialized United Nations system agency in 1977. Its purpose is to help developing countries expand their food production, improve nutrition, and combat rural poverty. It lends money for projects, either self-initiated or "co-financed" with other financial and development institutions. IFAD uses the services of its co-operating institutions, particularly the World Bank and the regional development banks, to appraise projects and supervise the implementation of all projects that it funds. The Governing Council of IFAD meets annually and for special sessions if needed, while the Executive Board generally meets four times a year to review and approve operational policies, loans and grants.

117. The 1981 JIU status report observed that IFAD had made a solid start towards determining and progressively improving the results and impact of its work, based on a comprehensive framework for monitoring and evaluating its development projects which was developed in 1979-1980. The IFAD evaluation system places particular emphasis on the use of local expertise and national institutions. IFAD helps to build national capacity in monitoring and evaluation (M & E) as a management tool for effective implementation and better planning. The M & E system is intended to be a simple and flexible one, focusing on the essential project objectives and involving continuous review and feedback.

118. Every loan agreement requires the borrowing country to establish satisfactory M & E arrangements for (a) monitoring progress in project execution, (b) on-going evaluation of project effects during implementation, and (c) ex post evaluation of the project impact on the target beneficiary groups relative to other socio-economic groups. The ex post evaluations are usually to be carried out, after project completion, by independent agencies based in the recipient country. They are intended to assess overall results, drawing on the monitoring data but often adding special studies as well.

119. The small IFAD Monitoring and Evaluation Division works closely with the Project Management Department to design an explicit M & E system for each project, using guidelines developed in 1979, with responsibility assigned to.

M & E units at project and/or **sectoral/national** levels. During the 1979-84 period, IFAD sent 144 short-term consultant missions to 99 projects located in 128 countries, primarily to assist project authorities in designing and installing M & E arrangements.

120. In 1981 IFAD began a series of in-depth reviews of its on-going projects by **major** categories and components. A 1981 review covered 27 credit projects for the rural poor, and a second comparative study in 1982-83 reviewed 32 integrated area and rural development projects (the largest category of IFAD-funded projects) in four regions. In addition, in 1983-84 mid-term evaluations of 14 projects with a wide **sectoral** and geographic spread were undertaken 30/. Besides reviewing progress in implementation, an important purpose of this exercise was to develop a reliable, quick methodology for assessing the benefits of a project on the various beneficiary groups. IFAD also reports to the Executive Board annually on monitoring and evaluation activities of the past year, the current M & E work programme, and future directions 31/. During 1985-86 follow-up M & E missions are planned to review M & E arrangements with a view to developing M & E guidelines for projects by broad sub-sectors (e.g. integrated rural development, credit, irrigation) and regions.

121. As **convenor** of the Monitoring and Evaluation Panel of the **ACC Task Force** on Rural Development, IFAD has also worked very actively with other agencies to develop common guiding principles for the design and use of M & E in rural development projects and programmes. These principles have now been approved by the Task Force for use throughout the United Nations system 32/.

122. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Although it is still a comparatively new **specialized** agency and has only a small staff contingent, IFAD has continued to establish and strengthen monitoring and evaluation as a central element of its programme. IFAD has a particularly important role to play in this area because of its co-operative activities with many other development institutions inside and outside the United Nations **system**, and its longer-range commitment to developing new indicators and analytical techniques to assess the impact of development projects.

#### XIV. INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION (ILO)

123. 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, 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 to supervise the work of the secretariat and various committees and commissions.

124. The 1981 JIU status report noted the early ILO concentration on project design and staff training to establish a firm basis for an ILO internal evaluation **system**, a process which has now largely been completed. The general procedures for the design and evaluation of ILO projects have been supplemented by procedures for technical co-operation and for research 33/. The **Evaluation Unit**, located in the Bureau of Programming and Management, has been very active in reviewing and informally consulting on project proposals and documents (almost 200 a year). Since 1979, the Unit has also conducted **more** than 50 design and evaluation seminars for 1,000 participants, about one-third of whom **came** from outside the ILO.

125. As these basic processes have become increasingly **institutionalized**, the Evaluation Unit role has shifted to refinement of methodological materials, **establishment** of evaluation schedules, provision of technical backstopping and

quality control for the evaluation system, and dissemination of evaluation information to users. Most ILO headquarters staff have now been trained, and training priorities now concentrate more on field staff and **government** officials. Self-evaluations of larger technical co-operation and research projects (including regular budget, multi-bilateral funded, and UNDP-funded) are now done every 12-18 months and upon project completion, and amount to about 50 reports per year. In addition, about 10 in-depth project evaluations are made annually, as well as occasional evaluations of country programmes, selected projects, or groups of projects.

126. At the urging of the External Auditor and at ~~the~~ request of the Governing Body, the Evaluation Unit was strengthened in 1984 (by one-half a professional post) to enable it to carry out programme evaluations as requested by the Governing Body, top management, or the programme bureau. These reports will supplement the three to five in-depth reviews and evaluation studies already prepared each year by or for the Governing Body on operational activities and particular programmes 34/, including five reports assessing selected projects and lessons learned ~~which~~ have been prepared by the Evaluation Unit since 1981 35/.

127. The ILO has also stressed the development of an evaluation information system to ensure that evaluation results are analyzed, disseminated and used in decision-making and future planning at the project management level, the technical programme level, and the top management and supervisory bodies level 36/. Almost 300 evaluation reports of ILO and other organizations (and methodological studies) have been gathered, and some 200 of these have been abstracted. ILO is recruiting a documentalist, and plans to establish a computerized evaluation database for easier retrieval by a wider group of potential users. The Evaluation Unit also seeks to systematically analyze and disseminate lessons learned from evaluations through briefings, abstracts prepared on request, seminars, distribution of external evaluation reports, links with programme analysts, a periodic evaluation newsletter, reports to the Governing Body, and other techniques now being developed and tested.

128. New efforts are underway in other areas. In addition to expanding design and evaluation processes to research projects, the Evaluation Unit has developed a **computerized** listing of about 1,000 representative progress **and/or** performance indicators and counsels staff on their selection. Increased attention is being given to the project monitoring process. Efforts are also underway to support the evaluation activities of governments through design and evaluation seminars in the field; wide dissemination of the ILO design and evaluation procedures in English, French and Spanish; and individual technical co-operation projects.

129. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The ILO has made gradual but steady and significant progress in developing its internal evaluation system on a step-by-step basis. From a foundation emphasizing the importance of good design and an understanding of the usefulness of evaluation as a management tool, ILO has now moved on to active project evaluation, programme evaluation, 'an evaluation information **system**, and reporting processes to fill out the overall evaluation system structure. The achievements to date should allow the expansion of system coverage and refinement of system quality to continue with a good sense of positive momentum.

## XV. INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION (IMO)

130. The work of IMO is directed towards the development of international standards on technical and related matters affecting international shipping, and the provision of assistance for implementing these standards. IMO has not only a biennial Assembly and a Council, which meets twice a year, but three major committees and an extensive network of subsidiary bodies which carry out approved work programmes.

131. IMO has not had an internal evaluation system in the past. Evaluation activity was limited to joint efforts for some of the technical co-operation projects which IMO conducts as the executing agency for UNDP-supported projects. Also, the many IMO inter-governmental bodies have had, and continue to have, a rather considerable and continuing involvement in the development, conduct, and review of IMO work.

132. A 1984 JIU report on IMO (JIU/REP/84/4) observed inter alia that IMO had devoted increasing attention to technical co-operation activities, and that its technical co-operation programme had grown threefold in the last decade without any corresponding increase in programme support staff. Since IMO made no systematic evaluation of technical co-operation projects or of the technical co-operation programme as a whole, the Inspectors noted that evaluation in particular might be expanded in any strengthening of technical co-operation operations.

133. In June 1984 the Secretary-General of IMO, as part of an initiative to strengthen technical co-operation support, observed that lack of an evaluation process was hampering IMO technical co-operation efforts. He proposed that evaluation be introduced and initially carried out as part of the responsibilities of the Director of his Office, assisted by a full-time principal administrative assistant and additional assistance, for the time being, from other staff as required. The Council of IMO approved these proposals and the decision became effective in July 1984. The first evaluation exercises will cover the advisory services for 1982-1984, the fellowships programme from 1978 to 1984, and the IMO/Norway co-operative programme of assistance to developing countries and the IMO/SIDA programme of assistance on marine pollution prevention from their inception to 1984.

134. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The proposals of the Secretary-General and the support expressed in the Council are a very positive initiative to help ensure the effectiveness and quality of IMO technical co-operation activities. As JIU observed in 1981, IMO does not need an elaborate internal evaluation system, but should consider evaluation ideas, approaches and techniques in use in other United Nations system organizations, in order to find and adapt those which it can simply and effectively apply. The new evaluation responsibility, well-located if very modestly staffed, and the new evaluation work programme should prove to be important aids to strengthen IMO programming, assessment and reporting functions.

#### XVI. INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (ITU)

135. The purposes of ITU are to promote international co-operation in telegraph, telephone and radio services to further their development and extend their use by the public. The four permanent organs of ITU - 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 a Co-ordination Committee. Guidance is provided by the Plenipotentiary Conference which meets periodically (most recently in 1982, next in 1989), Administrative Conferences, the Plenary Assemblies of the CCITT and CCIR, and the Administrative Council which normally meets once a year.

136. ITU does not have an internal evaluation system, nor does it have a programme structure or a programme budget. ITU headquarters essentially acts as an inter-governmental secretariat which assists in the execution of a work programme which the Members establish for themselves, using many conferences, committees, study groups, and interim working parties. Practically all this work relates directly to tasks carried out by national telecommunication administrations and by organizations and agencies recognized by them in the Member States. The Technical

Co-operation Department does carry out evaluation activities as an executing agency for UNDP-supported projects, following the evaluation procedures and guidelines established by UNDP.

137. During the past few years, however, ITU has been considering some significant operational changes. The 1982 Plenipotentiary Conference in Nairobi reviewed several preliminary reports and called for further consideration, studies, and action to: improve the ITU budget format and present it in functional form; improve cost analysis activities; review ITU management processes and re-consider the need to establish an ITU internal audit department; and rationalize ITU work through the fullest possible application of modern office technologies. In particular, the Conference stressed the need to improve ITU operational capacities in technical co-operation by re-organizing the Technical Co-operation Department to ensure effective and economical performance, and to establish regular reporting on technical co-operation progress, effectiveness, and qualitative and quantitative assessments of difficulties encountered. The Conference instructed the Administrative Council to set up an independent study team to review overall ITU technical co-operation activities. The Council deferred action on this resolution in the light of the work of the Independent Commission (see below), and subsequently requested in 1985 that the JIU carry out this review. JIU will report thereon through the Secretary-General of the Union to the Administrative Council in 1986.

138. In addition, in 1982 the Plenipotentiary Conference decided to establish an Independent Commission for World-wide Telecommunications Development to recommend ways in which the expansion of telecommunications could be stimulated. The December 1984 report of the Commission called for a series of steps to provide a higher priority for telecommunications investment, make existing networks in developing countries more effective and able to appropriately use new technologies, improve financing of telecommunications development, and enable the ITU to play a more effective role. The Commission recommended that a new Centre for Telecommunications Development be established in ITU, that the Secretary-General study a proposal for an organization to co-ordinate development of telecommunication, worldwide (WORLDTEL), and that he monitor the implementation of all the Commission's recommendations and report on progress made. The Administrative Council decided in July 1985 to set up the Centre within the framework of the ITU, with a separate and identifiable budget from voluntary contributions and its own Advisory Board. When the Centre becomes operational, it might prove to be an area of ITU activity where more formal monitoring and evaluation procedures could be particularly useful.

139. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: ITU does not appear to need a comprehensive evaluation system because of its complicated organizational structure and the considerable involvement of Member States in its technical work. However, in the light of the current reassessment of ITU management processes and operational activities, the concern of the Plenipotentiary Conference with ensuring the effectiveness of ITU technical co-operation activities and rationalizing ITU work, and the new Centre for Telecommunications Development, ITU assessment processes could well be strengthened through adaptation of monitoring, evaluation and reporting techniques developed by other organizations, both large and small, in the United Nations system.

140. Recommendation for the International Telecommunication Union: Although the ITU does not appear to need a comprehensive evaluation system at present, it should be alert to the considerable expansion of evaluation and reporting activities and techniques which has occurred in the United Nations system during the past few years. In particular, ITU should consider the initiatives recently taken by the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization to establish internal evaluation systems; the revision of technical co-operation monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes underway by the United Nations Development Programme and an inter-agency working group; and initiatives within the system to develop and support evaluation capacities of

government a. Some or all of these approaches should prove useful to improve overall ITU processes of analysis and assessment of results of operations, and to more systematically report thereon to its governing bodies.

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

141. The purposes of UNESCO are to contribute to peace and security in the world by promoting collaboration among nations through education, science, culture and communication in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed by the Charter of the United Nations. UNESCO pursues its aims through international intellectual co-operation in its fields of competence, and operational activities for development embracing social and cultural as well as economic dimensions. The General Conference meets biennially to decide on UNESCO policies and the programme and budget, while the Executive Board meets at least three times a year to supervise the programme.

142. The 1981 JIU status report observed that significant initial steps had been taken to develop the guidelines for an internal evaluation system which the Executive Board had established in 1978, but that - as a 1980 evaluation status report had indicated - much remained to be done. The very diverse evaluation and assessment activities in various UNESCO programme sectors and the scattered evaluation resources placed considerable burden on the small central evaluation unit's responsibility to "organize and systematize" evaluation work. JIU concluded that a solid conceptual framework had been established and a logical sequence of further steps programmed, but that the next few years would be critical if the evaluation system were to be effectively established and implemented. JIU recommended that the central evaluation unit be strengthened and the management information system streamlined and integrated as part of the development of a comprehensive evaluation system.

143. The most important step taken in the 1981-83 period was the experimental introduction of the Performance Evaluation and Monitoring System (PEMS) to improve efficiency and heighten staff awareness of the need for evaluation. However, UNESCO concluded at the end of 1983 that PEMS could not be generally applied because it was too specific a system, was not adequately controlled, and required extensive programme staff work without conveying relevant information to higher management levels. Many other diverse management reporting, audit, evaluation, and other review activities were undertaken during this period, but in an ad hoc fashion.

144. In December 1983 the Director-General established an Intersectoral Evaluation Committee of high-level managers to advise him on the design, co-ordination, and oversight of evaluation activities. In May 1984, he established five consultative working groups to improve the functioning of UNESCO, including one on evaluation methods and techniques. The group reviewed proposals of the Director-General and recommended that a central evaluation unit be established in his Office, supplemented by small units in the sectors and some regional offices, to establish an evaluation system with three categories of evaluation: (a) on-going self-evaluation by programme specialists; (b) programme and sub-programme evaluations; And (c) ex post impact evaluations. It also stressed that directorate and staff commitment to evaluation must be positively developed, especially through staff training programmes and demonstrations that evaluation is actually used to improve the content of activities and streamline their execution 37/.

145. The Executive Board has continued to encourage evaluation efforts, and has recommended that resources for evaluation be increased. In October 1984 a Temporary Committee of the Board, which also reviewed the functioning of UNESCO,

further stressed the importance of: evaluation of UNESCO's programme, especially by Member States; a Central Evaluation Unit operating with clearly defined functions; a mix of internal and external evaluation; clear sub-programme targets and indicators; keeping evaluation as simple and inexpensive as possible; and the possible preparation of long-term evaluation plans 38/.

146. Following the recommendations of the working group and proposals submitted **to** and endorsed by the Executive Board, the Director-General took steps in December 1984 to set up the Central Evaluation Unit (CEU), attached to the Directorate, and **to** establish an evaluation system comprising the three categories of evaluation mentioned above. The four professional posts in the Unit were staffed in April and May 1985, and one or several staff members have been **designated** in each programme sector to be responsible for implementation of evaluation activities.

147. The CEU is required to co-ordinate and lead evaluation activities, including those financed by extrabudgetary resources and especially operational projects, and to undertake the analyses and studies needed for the establishment and functioning of the evaluation system. The CEU will see to the implementation of the first two categories of evaluation activities and, in liaison with the sectors concerned, organize impact evaluations. On the basis of work carried out in 1981-1983, efforts have been made, again in close collaboration with the programme sectors, **to** develop a new system for self-evaluation of the **Organization's** activities. This system is to be **finalized** in 1985 and expert outside opinion sought on it before an initial experiment in self-evaluation is carried out. In **addition**, three impact evaluations are underway which are scheduled to be completed by the end of 1985. Their results will be made available to the governing bodies 39/. Eight impact evaluation activities have been proposed for the 1986-1987 biennium.

148. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The unsuccessful experiment with the PEMS system cost valuable time in establishing a UNESCO internal evaluation system. While most other **organizations have** made considerable recent progress in expanding and refining their established evaluation systems, UNESCO remains in the same position as reported on by the JIU in 1981: preparing to implement its evaluation system. Substantial progress has been made to remedy this situation during 1985, but active **support** and oversight is needed from UNESCO top management and governing bodies to ensure that at least the major evaluation components will be applied as soon as possible in a co-ordinated and systematic way to all types of UNESCO activities.

149. Recommendation for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation: In view of the time which has already elapsed since the Executive Board approved guidelines for a UNESCO internal evaluation system in 1978, UNESCO top management and governing bodies should play a particularly active role in supporting and reviewing progress in establishing and using the various evaluation system components, to ensure that this system begins to fulfill its proper, integral role in improving the effectiveness and impact of UNESCO programme activities.

#### XVIII. UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (UNIDO)

150. 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. During 1985, UNIDO was transferred from a component of the United Nations to an independent **specialized** agency within the United Nations system. Its policy-making organs are the General Conference and the Industrial Development Board, and a Programme and Budget Committee oversees operational and financial matters.

151. The 1981 JIU status report expressed concern that while UNIDO had established a framework for a comprehensive evaluation system, the small UNIDO evaluation unit had devoted most of its work to joint thematic evaluation studies with UNDP and had fallen behind its earlier goals for developing and implementing an internal evaluation system. At the urging of its Permanent Committee, the Secretariat had committed itself to system implementation during the 1980-81 biennium, and JIU also recommended concerted action to establish a practical, UNIDO-wide system.

152. UNIDO has moved forcefully to overcome this system development lag. A performance (built-in self-evaluation) system has been completely installed, tested during two years of initial operation, revised, and is now fully operational. A similar evaluation system for group training activities has been developed and implemented. A tri-lingual Design and Evaluation Manual of policies, procedures and guidelines for the above types of UNIDO-executed projects has been issued 40/, and a second volume will eventually follow with guidance for other UNIDO-managed activities, primarily at the programme level.

153. The system requires performance/self-evaluations of all larger projects financed from all sources of funds at least once a year (about 100 were carried out in 1984), terminal self-evaluations (19 in 1984), and also includes in-depth tripartite project evaluations (about 20 to 25 a year). In addition to the self-evaluation of group training activities, an initial in-depth programme evaluation has been undertaken, and others may follow. Further expansion of evaluation is under discussion, but UNIDO feels that the present mix of evaluation types and coverage is adequate for the near term.

154. The evaluation unit has gradually reached its full complement of four professional staff members, and evaluation functions are now placed under the Deputy Executive Director. The unit has conducted 30 evaluation workshops at headquarters and in 10 countries for about 160 UNIDO headquarters and field staff (and about 250 government and 100 UNDP and other UN staff as well) and is continuing this process. It is actively involved in UNIDO efforts to strengthen project design through training, guidelines, briefings, formal or informal consultation on some 80 to 100 project designs per year, and assistance in formulating large-scale projects. The unit also devotes about one-fifth of its time to oversight of evaluation system functioning, to ensure that evaluation policies and procedures are complied with and that established standards are being maintained. Evaluation staff participate directly in about 7 to 10 of the in-depth tripartite project evaluations per year, and are involved in preparations for almost all the rest.

155. The Design and Evaluation Manual contains specific procedures and formats for internal evaluation reporting, and they are now in operation along with review and follow-up processes. The self-evaluation reports combine comments from field staff and headquarters technical staff with evaluation unit processing to provide timely preparation for annual reviews, effective feedback, quality control, greater reliability and objectivity, and full integration of evaluation into the regular management system. The evaluation unit maintains evaluation plans and provides draft status and summary reports to top management, including "exception reporting" on compliance, reports on problems in individual projects, and ad hoc staff papers. A modest, computerized, self-evaluation status reporting system has been established, which will eventually allow analysis of patterns in the reports and establishment of an evaluation memory bank. The evaluation unit has also provided summary reports through top management to the Permanent Committee and the Industrial Development Board at least once a year on progress in evaluation system development and use 41/. These bodies have played an important supportive role in evaluation system development in UNIDO, and have continued to encourage system expansion and detailed feedback on results achieved.

/...



156. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: UNIDO has made rapid and significant **progress** in introducing, installing, and using a comprehensive internal evaluation system **since** 1980. Evaluation appears to have become much more widely accepted and used to improve project and programme design, performance and **effectiveness**. The challenge for UNIDO, as for other **organizations** which have established their systems, is to continue to refine and expand evaluation activities and their quality as an integral part of UNIDO management decision-making.

#### XIX. UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION (UPU)

157. The purposes of the UPU are to form a single postal territory of countries for the reciprocal exchange of Letter-post items, **organize and improve postal services** and promote international collaboration, and undertake technical **assistance** in postal matters as requested by Member States. The Universal Postal Congress usually meets every five years, while the Executive Council and the 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.

158. **UPU's** evaluation efforts continue to be limited to its technical co-operation activities. Possibilities for an internal evaluation system are constrained by its **"work programme"**, which is actually a list of studies on various topics which the Congress establishes every five years to be carried out by the two Councils. In 1976 a more coherent programming system was proposed to the Executive Council and was discussed at the 1979 Congress. In 1980 the Secretary-General observed to the Council that any expansion of the internal evaluation **system** beyond technical co-operation would first require a careful cost-benefit assessment, in the light of the nature of UPU activities and the resources available, and would have to be done selectively and on a trial basis. The Council advised the **1984** Congress that the introduction of medium-term planning and **programme** budgeting did not **seem** to meet the existing requirements of UPU bodies. Recently, however, at the request of the Director-General, the Executive Council has approved the creation of a working group to rationalize the operations of the International Bureau. Among its tasks **will** be an examination of UPU evaluation activities and the possibility of expanding them.

159. UPU technical co-operation evaluation work continues under the methods adopted by the Executive Council in 1973, which generally follow UNDP policies and procedures. UPU regularly prepares reports assessing its technical co-operation results, and has also developed follow-up missions to review the efficiency of postal programmes. A stated aim of UPU technical co-operation is to expand evaluation exercises and to forward the results to the countries concerned as a form of feedback. In addition, UPU has given the principal role for regional projects to the countries concerned. It conducted co-ordination and evaluation meetings on inter-country projects in two **regions** during 1980, and hopes to continue and expand such meetings in the future.

160. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Expansion of UPU evaluation activities may have to await revision of its programming and budgeting procedures. Nevertheless, the planned reconsideration of UPU secretariat operations may **suggest** the benefits of applying some of the evaluation and reporting techniques developed by other **organizations**, both large and small) in the United Nations system.

161. Recommendation for the Universal Postal Union: Although the UPU does not appear to need a comprehensive evaluation system at present, it should be alert to the considerable expansion of evaluation and reporting activities and techniques which has occurred in the United Nations system during the past few years. In particular, UPU should consider the initiatives recently taken by the International Civil Aviation **Organization** and the International Maritime **Organization** to establish

internal evaluation systems ; the revision of technical co-operation monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes underway by the United Nations Development Programme and an inter-agency working group; and initiatives within the system to develop and support evaluation capacities of governments. Some or all of these approaches should prove useful to improve overall UPU processes of analysis and assessment of results of operations, and to more systematically report thereon to its governing bodies.

## XX. WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (WFP)

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

163. The 1981 JIU status report noted the experience and effective work of the WFP Evaluation Service, which was established in 1969, but expressed concern that the Service had had to spread its evaluation and feedback work too thinly in order to support other parts of the WFP management process. JIU recommended that WFP consider ways to strengthen its project planning, formulation, monitoring, and management information and reporting procedures, including a self-evaluation system which would allow the Service to concentrate its resources on evaluation. WFP has subsequently taken quite substantial steps in this direction.

164. In April 1984 a WFP report summarized plans for improvement of the WFP project cycle 42/, which were endorsed by the CFA. Based on WFP's own experience, three consultant reports prepared in 1983, and the experience of FAO and other United Nations system agencies, WFP began an incremental, longer-term effort to update its management processes. The substantive and procedural objectives include assuring that WFP aid is responsive to and integrated into national development plans and priorities; strengthening project preparation and reporting; increasing the participation of the CFA and of other United Nations system agencies; and achieving better projects, more effective staff utilization, and improved monitoring and evaluation. To initiate this process, WFP has begun a series of country food aid planning reviews, and is revising its project preparation procedures to focus with increased rigour on project planning and design for large-scale and/or innovative projects.

165. In order to facilitate project management and simultaneously provide a better basis for performance evaluation, WFP is strengthening its current project monitoring system in two ways. Quarterly implementation reports will focus more rigorously on the intended flows of project inputs and outputs as part of a computerised WFP management information system with an automatic alert procedure to indicate if and when scheduled inputs and outputs are not proceeding as planned. This procedure will pinpoint constraints and bottlenecks more efficiently and signal areas where immediate corrective action should be taken. A second system under consideration focuses on the more regular on-site assessment and documentation of the extent to which intended immediate project objectives are being achieved. The objectives will relate specifically to the intended role(s) and function(s) of food aid and the immediate intended effects of projects and will be more explicitly defined when projects are being formulated. The on-site assessments will, similarly, be defined during the project preparation stage and will be provided for in project budgets. They will be executed as part of normal project operations at the local level in co-operation with national research institutions that will be contracted for this purpose. Where possible, the assessment of project effects will also be designed to lay the groundwork for true impact evaluation.

166. These two new systems are intended to facilitate project monitoring, improve project management, and permit more rigorous project evaluation in terms of the achievement of objectives and the net contributions of food aid in supporting larger national development goals and alleviating emergency requirements. These improvements, in turn, should allow more resources to be used for the development of more effective feedback mechanisms and linkages to policy formulation and may permit additional in-depth or impact evaluations. However, the costs, sophisticated research designs, time requirements and data collection demands for in-depth impact studies will require that they be undertaken only for a limited number of carefully selected projects with broader significance for the WFP programme.

167. At present, the 11 professional staff in the Evaluation Service spend about 80 per cent of their time conducting and reporting on evaluations, with the remainder devoted to systems development, oversight and project design. In accord with the new processes outlined above, however, the Service will be designing and introducing low-cost, built-in **monitoring** and evaluation systems in selected field projects; assisting several recipient countries to develop monitoring and evaluation systems; replacing past project terminal reports with a more analytical summary report to the CFA on lessons learned; helping develop the training programmes for staff and country authorities necessitated by the new systems; and assisting in the development of the improved, standardized field project performance monitoring and reporting systems.

168. WFP has reported very actively to the CFA on evaluation for many years. In addition to internal reporting and follow-up on evaluation missions, the Evaluation Service submits about a dozen summary evaluation reports to each semi-annual session of the CFA, with particular attention to projects being considered for a new phase. The CFA recently requested an expansion of evaluation work to cover selected emergency operations. The Evaluation Service has also undertaken a dozen special "sectoral evaluation" studies in close collaboration with the United Nations system agencies responsible for those sectors.

169. **SUMMARY ASSESSMENT:** WFP has undertaken significant efforts to strengthen and update the procedures and processes for its overall project management cycle. The initiatives taken should allow it to better achieve sound and appropriate food aid projects, close oversight of project implementation and progress towards planned objectives, and up-to-date, results-oriented status reporting. This overall strengthening, in turn, should increasingly allow the Evaluation Service, top management, and the CFA to concentrate on more systematic analysis of the effectiveness of food aid provided, and on lessons learned as a basis for future programme improvement.

## XXI. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO)

170. The purpose of WHO is the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health. This has 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.

171. In 1981 the World Health Assembly adopted a Global Strategy for health for all, based on national and regional strategies, and in 1982 it approved a Plan of Action. To support achievement of the Strategy and the Plan, WHO has greatly modified its programme management functions to establish unified managerial

processes, both for national health development (MPNHD) and for WHO programme development (MPWPD). Evaluation is an integral part of these processes, as reflected in the guiding principles for national health development 43/ 44/ and within WHO itself 45/. The major developmental phase for the managerial processes, which was discussed in the 1981 JIU evaluation status report, ended in 1982. The primary emphasis now is on applying them.

172. Because of this unified managerial process which is applied organization-wide at all levels in the decentralized WHO structure, there is **no** "evaluation unit" per se. Individual programme managers in countries, regional offices and at headquarters are responsible for the evaluation of their own programmes, production of evaluation documents, discussions with various committees, and corrective actions where required. A single officer reporting to the Headquarters Programme Committee is responsible for promoting proper use and any needed up-dating of the managerial process (including evaluation) at all organizational levels, and Particularly for assisting regional office efforts. All new WHO staff are briefed and trained on evaluation in a session on the managerial process. During the 1983-85 period professional staff are being re-trained in advanced briefing seminars on organizational policies and strategies including evaluation.

173. The basic WHO process is thus one of continuous self-evaluation, and it is estimated that 10 to 15 per cent of total WHO professional staff time is devoted to programming and evaluation activities. ALL country activities are reported on bi-annually to regional offices (with an evaluative component), with similar annual reporting from all regional offices to headquarters. All WHO programmes are reviewed in depth in a similar process prior to preparing each biennial programme budget.

x74. Programme managers or regional committees or sub-committees often do in-depth evaluations of certain programmes. Various technical advisory groups or programme advisory committees provide some form of external evaluation for most WHO programmes, and the governing bodies carry out policy evaluation 46/, receive selected in-depth evaluations for review, and review summary evaluations of each programme at the time of the programme budget discussions.

175. In 1983-84 WHO made a survey of its ongoing evaluation activities, methods and mechanisms, which showed that a considerable volume and wide variety of evaluation was taking place. The WHO External Auditor reported in 1984 that levels of achievement in monitoring and evaluation varied considerably in three regional offices in 1982-83. However, the Auditor also reported that the staff appeared to be fully aware of the importance of these processes and the need to improve them, and that overall control of programme and project implementation and achievement of objectives was good. WHO has biennial plans for its MPWPD (including evaluation) within the programme budget cycle, and the responsible officer for MPWPD makes regular status, summary, and subject reports on evaluation to management committees and working groups.

176. A major concern of WHO governing bodies at present is the monitoring and evaluation of the strategies for health for all. In addition to its own regular monitoring of progress and review of the effectiveness of the Global Strategy, the World Health Assembly has invited Member States to do the same for national strategies, using a common framework and format 47/, appropriate indicators, and support from the WHO secretariat. Initial progress reports by Member States on national strategies were prepared in 1983, followed by programme reviews by regional and global governing bodies. In 1985 Member States prepared the first evaluation reports on their strategies for review by the regional and global governing bodies. Subsequent reviews to monitor progress will occur each two years, while those evaluating effectiveness will take place at six-year intervals. These reviews will also assess the extent and effectiveness of WHO support for the strategies through its programme of work,

177. The extensive evaluation coverage and experience now obtained in WHO and its support of governments' efforts have of course disclosed areas for further improvement. WHO is taking steps to improve the quality of evaluation and ensure that it is a consistent and cost-effective process. It is reinforcing evaluation efforts at country level with Member States, using numerous seminars in all regions to help strengthen national health monitoring and evaluation capacities, develop a close consultative process, and ensure the relevance of WHO programmes to Member States' national health development needs. Evaluation experience has also exposed the very limited quality of information for evaluation, often originating from the lack of information in Member States themselves, as a major obstacle which requires continuing management information system improvement efforts. While WHO feels that considerable progress in evaluation coverage and use has been made in the last few years, assuring evaluation quality is still recognized as a long-term development process to convince managers of its usefulness and strengthen managerial self-reliance at all organizational levels.

178. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Since 1978, WHO has established one of the most extensive evaluation systems among United Nations system organizations, and has made the most progress in thoroughly integrating it into the basic management cycle for Member States and the secretariat throughout its decentralized structure. This progress has generated support and use at all levels. At the same time, system experience has confirmed the need for continuing efforts by all concerned to improve evaluation quality and ensure evaluation relevance. It has also called attention, as it should, to the need to strengthen other parts of the managerial processes and continually re-orient programme efforts.

## XXII. WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO)

179. WIPO was established in 1967 and became a specialized agency of the United Nations system in 1974. Its purposes are to promote the protection of intellectual property throughout the world through co-operation among states, and to ensure administrative co-operation among states in various international agreements on such matters as patents, trademarks, industrial designs, and the protection of literary and artistic works. The Conference, to which all WIPO Member States belong, and the General Assembly (composed of Member States which are also members of the previously established Paris or Berne Unions) meet biennially to direct the International Bureau, or secretariat, of WIPO. The secretariat provides documents and services for meetings and carries out projects to promote increased intellectual co-operation among Member States in this field.

180. WIPO does not have a separate evaluation unit. Its small size and internal communications processes provide for rapid and complete information flow between officials, with continuing internal evaluation being an integral part of management activities. Progress and achievements in all programmes and projects of the organization are formally reviewed by the Director General, in two-day management meetings with the Deputy Directors General and Directors, held four times a year. These meetings provide for internal evaluation as well as performance reporting and monitoring.

181. Direct feedback from users is obtained by various means, such as having expert working groups develop revisions of the International Patent Classification. In addition, detailed reports on activities are submitted to three Permanent Committees for review, and detailed reports are also submitted to the WIPO Governing Bodies as a basis for adopting new programmes and budgets. WIPO also carries out evaluation activities, with governments, as an executing agency for UNDP-supported projects, following UNDP guidelines and procedures.

182. In 1979, at the request of its Budget Committee, WIPO presented a report describing the evaluation-related processes then in use within the secretariat. The report also explored the possibility for more explicit and institutionalized external evaluation activities through the creation of an Evaluation Working Group for each of the two Permanent Committees for Development Co-operation, to assess reports which might be prepared by a small new secretariat unit. Following discussions in 1979 and 1981, however, the governing bodies decided that there was no need at that time to add to the existing WIPO machinery for evaluation.

183. Several additional evaluation activities have since been introduced in WIPO. Formal evaluation mechanisms are now built into certain programmes such as fellowships (evaluation by participants and lecturers of training courses) and patent information services (evaluation by recipients of the service provided). While WIPO has always had governments evaluate the projects which it executes, it has also recently introduced regional evaluation and planning meetings on its development co-operation activities. A meeting for Asia and the Pacific was held in Thailand in June 1984, with the assistance of UNDP, to discuss the 1982-1986 programme for that region. A detailed preparatory document reviewed evaluation elements and aids for the 1982-1984 period, examined the proposed programme for 1984-1986, and provided a look ahead to the 1987-1991 period. Similar meetings were held in Colombia in August 1984 for Latin America and the Caribbean, in Geneva in May 1985 for Arab countries, and in Togo in July 1985 for Africa. Furthermore, the new computerized system being developed for budgeting and financial control will allow for closer cost and performance monitoring of all WIPO activities.

184. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Because of its existing evaluation mechanisms and small size, WIPO does not appear to need a more extensive evaluation system at present. It should nevertheless continue to consider evaluation ideas, approaches and techniques in use in other United Nations system organizations, in order to find and adapt those which it can simply and effectively apply.

### XXIII. WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION (WMO)

185. The purpose of WMO is to co-ordinate, standardize and improve world meteorological and related activities and encourage an efficient exchange of meteorological and related information between countries. The WMO Congress meets once every four years to adopt technical regulations on meteorological practices and procedures, and to decide on the policies, programme and budget. The Executive Council, composed of 36 members, meets at least once a year to supervise implementation of the programme, decide on the annual budget, and offer advice to Member States on technical matters. There are also six regional meteorological associations, and eight technical commissions which study the applications of meteorology and problems and developments in specialized fields.

186. WMO's evaluation activities have not changed much in the past decade. Evaluation is still largely confined to technical co-operation projects, with oversight provided by the Programme Support and Co-ordination Division in the Technical Co-operation Department. Since about half of WMO technical co-operation funds come from UNDP, WMO is presently participating in the revision of the UNDP evaluation policies and procedures and will use the final versions as a basis for the evaluation of its technical co-operation activities. In addition, WMO sends an annual questionnaire to government representatives and field experts requesting their evaluation of technical co-operation activities, especially training, which provides the basis for the annual review and adjustment of technical co-operation by the Executive Council.

107. Other WMO activities contain extensive review and reporting processes. The WMO scientific and technical programmes are planned, co-ordinated, implemented

and reviewed through the eight technical commissions and several special panels. The commissions submit annual reports to the Executive Council in which progress and programme delivery is checked against specific objectives, plus a special in-depth review report once every four years. Co-ordination matters are discussed at annual meetings of the presidents of the technical commissions.

188. In addition, the Regional Associations assess regional progress at their regular meetings and report to the Executive Council. A Panel of Experts reviews progress and reports biannually on education and training activities, and the Publications Board meets six times a year to review detailed reports on publications. Finally, the Annual Report of the Secretary-General focuses on the activities, progress and status of the WMO programmes.

189. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: Because of its relatively extensive assessment and reporting processes, WMO does not appear to need a full 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 developed by other organizations, both large and small, in the United Nations system.

190. Recommendation for the World Meteorological Organization: Although WMO does not appear to need a comprehensive evaluation system at present, it should be alert to the considerable expansion of evaluation and reporting activities and techniques which has occurred in the United Nations system during the past few years. In particular, WMO should consider the initiative recently taken by the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization to establish internal evaluation systems; the revision of technical co-operation monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes underway by the United Nations Development Programme and an inter-country working group; and initiatives within the system to develop and support evaluation capacities of governments. Some or all of these approaches should prove useful to improve overall WMO processes of analysis and assessment of results of operations, and to more systematically report thereon to its governing bodies.

#### XXIV. WORLD BANK

191. The World 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.

192. The Bank's well-established independent evaluation system, as discussed in the 1981 JIU evaluation status report, is supervised by the Director-General, Operations Evaluation, who reports to the Executive Director and the President. The Operations Evaluation Department (OED), headed by a Director and 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 work, programme and budgeting, policy and research, and training and organizational matters.

193. 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 projects by OED staff. In view of the rapid increase in the number of completed projects (now about 250 every year), the Executive Director decided that, beginning in

mid-1982, OED would directly audit only half the completed projects, using selection criteria approved by the Executive Directors and including an element of random selection. About 60 per cent of such independent OED reviews each year are accompanied by visits to borrowing countries and extensive discussions at the project, executing agency and central government levels. Draft performance audit reports are sent to borrower governments and the responsible departments for comment, then finalized and released to the Executive Directors and the President.

194. In addition, an Annual Review is published which synthesises the findings of the preceding year's project evaluations so as to maintain a continuing overview of project experience, lessons learned from both successes and failures, and their implications 48/. A computerized record of all findings is also maintained and the OED reporting process includes an annual report on operations evaluation itself 49/. The overall emphasis is on participative assessment and systematic 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.

195. In addition to about 1100 performance audits done to date, OED has continued a programme of some 12-15 special studies each year in three areas: (a) evaluation studies which identify programmatic patterns of project clusters to improve sector policy and future project design and implementation; (b) operational policy reviews which focus on experience with operational policies and procedures to identify improvement possibilities; and (c) impact studies which visit projects a few years after completion to attempt to identify their wider direct and indirect impact.

196. This programme of special studies and reviews has been substantially changed in the past few years to focus on policy and institutional issues, whether at the macroeconomic country level or at the sector and project level. A new series of studies has been initiated to review the results of Bank and borrower interaction over time at the macroeconomic, sector policies and institutions, and project aggregate levels in the major sectors of Bank involvement. To undertake these new lines of work, OED professional staff resources have been increased to a total of 60 in 1984. Additional resources have been provided to engage external consultants when needed.

197. The Bank is working to systematically strengthen evaluation work by governments, not only through "built-in" monitoring and evaluation capacity in its projects, particularly in the social sectors, but for general evaluation functions as well, using on-the-job training and informal regional seminars. Monitoring and evaluation both at the project and national levels have also been included in courses given by the Economic Development Institute,

198. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT: The World Bank operates in a situation more directly oriented to large-scale development operations than other United Nations system organizations, and it has a correspondingly larger evaluation staff. However, the concepts and practices underlying its evaluation system, particularly the recent shift from the well-established base of project evaluation work to focus on evaluation of broader policy and programme issues, help indicate directions in which the evaluation systems of the other organizations are also moving.



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT DOCUMENTS

United Nations

1/ "Secretary-General's Bulletin: Regulations and rules governing programme planning, the programme aspects of the budget, the monitoring of Implementation and the methods of evaluation", ST/SGB/204 of 14 June 1984.

2/ "Programme planning: Strengthening the capacity of the United Nations evaluation units and systems . . . : Report of the Secretary-General", UN document A/38/133 of 22 April 1983.

3/ "Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its twenty-third session", Part I, Chapter V.E., General Assembly Official Records: Thirty-eighth session, supplement no. 38 (A/38/38), New York, 1984.

4/ "Programme planning: Strengthening the capacity of the United Nations evaluation units and systems: Report of the Secretary-General", UN document A/C.5/39/45 of 19 November 1984.

5/ "Evaluation: Programme evaluation for the period 1976-1979: Miners' Resources: Report of the Secretary-General", UN document E/AC.51/1982/5 of 1 March 1982.

6/ "Programme planning: Programme performance of the United Nations for the biennium 1982-1983: Report of the Secretary-General", UN document A/39/173 of 13 April 1984 and Add. 1.

7/ "First report on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987", Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, General Assembly Official Records: Fortieth Session, supplement no. 7 (A/40/7), New York, 1985.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

8/ "Overview of evaluative activities in UNICEF", Executive Board, ECOSOC document E/ICEF/1984/L.3 of 22 February 1984.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

9/ "Note by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD on evaluation", Trade and Development Board, UNCTAD document TD/B/1015 of 8 August 1984 and Annex.

10/ "Management-oriented evaluation in UNCTAD: Note by the UNCTAD Secretariat", Trade and Development Board, UNCTAD document TD/B/WP/37 of 14 February 1985.

11/ "Evaluation plan for UNCTAD for 1986: Report by the UNCTAD secretariat", Trade and Development Board, UNCTAD document TD/B/1067 and Add. 1 of 4 and 12 July 1985.

International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT (ITC)

12/ "Annual report on the activities of the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT 1984", V. "Evaluation", Joint Advisory Group, ITC document ITC/AG(XVIII)/95 of 31 December 1984.

13/ "Report on the evaluation of the ITC programme on manpower development for trade promotion and international marketing", Joint Advisory Group, ITC document ITC/AG(XVIII)/94 of 31 October 1984.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

14/ "Arrangements for the evaluation of the results and of the effectiveness of the programme: Note by the Administrator", Governing Council, Interessional Committee of the Whole, UNDP document DP/1983/ICW/6 of 22 December 1982.

15/ "Evaluation system of the United Nations Development Programme", JIU/REP/83/5 of March 1983. UNDP document DP/1983/68 of 10 May 1983.

16/ "Human resource development for primary health care", Evaluation Study no. 9, UNDP, New York, December 1983.

17/ "Programme implementation: Evaluation: Report of the Administrator", Governing Council, UNDP document DP/1984/18 of 6 March 1984.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

18/ "Evaluation report 1985: Report of the Executive Director", UNEP, Nairobi, 1985.

United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)

19/ "Report of the Executive Director reviewing UNFPA programming procedures", Governing Council, UNDP document DP/1984/35 of 11 April 1984.

20/ "Report of the Executive Director on the evaluation activities of UNFPA", Governing Council, UNDP document DP/1984/33 of 13 March 1984.

21/ "UNFPA guidelines and procedures for independent, in-depth evaluations", UNFPA, New York, March 1984.

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

22/ "UNHCR evaluation of assistance activities", Executive Committee, Sub-committee on Administrative and Financial Matters, UNHCR document EC/SC.2/17 of 7 June 1984.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

23/ "Evaluation of regular and field programmes", Director-General's bulletin no. 84/28 of 6 June 1984.

24/ "Review of the regular programme 1982-1983", FAO document C 83/8 of July 1983.

25/ "Review of field programmes 1982-1983", FAO document C 83/4 of July 1983.

26/ "Guidelines for the evaluation of technical cooperation projects", Evaluation Service, October 1984.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

27/ "Procedures manual for evaluating IAEA technical co-operation projects", Evaluation Unit, Department of Technical Co-operation, 1985.

28/ "Technical co-operation evaluation activities in 1984: Report by the Secretariat", Board of Governors, IAEA document GOV/INF/460 of 8 November 1984.

International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO)

29/ "Technical assistance: Techniques of evaluation of programmes of technical cooperation in the United Nations system", Council, ICAO document C-UP17834 of 18 May 1984.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

30/ "Mid-term evaluations of fourteen IFAD-initiated projects", Executive Board, IFAD document EB 84/22/R.49 of 10 August 1984.

31/ "Annual progress report on monitoring and evaluation", Executive Board, IFAD document EB 85/24/R.18 of 26 February 1985.

32/ "Guiding principles for the design and use of monitoring and evaluation in rural development projects and programmes", United Nations ACC Task Force on Rural Development, Panel on Monitoring and Evaluation, Rome, December 1984.

International Labour Organisation (ILO)

33/ "Procedures for the design and evaluation of ILO projects", Volume II, "Technical Co-operation" of May 1981 (Revised), Volume III, "Research" of February 1982, ILO, Bureau of Programming and Management.

34/ "Evaluation of the international programme for the improvement of working conditions and environment (PIACT)", Report VII, International Labour Conference, ILO, Geneva, 1984.

35/ "Design and evaluation of operational activities: (b) Assessment of selected projects". Governing Body, Committee on Operational Programmes, ILO document GB.224/OP/2/2 of November 1983.

36/ "Design and evaluation of operational activities: (a) Evaluation information system", Governing Body, Committee on Operational Programmes, ILO document GB.224/OP/2/1 of November 1983.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)

37/ "Report by the Director-General on the initiatives he has taken to improve the functioning of the Organisation", Annex III(A), "Report to the Director-General of the Consultative Working Group on Evaluation Methods and Techniques", Executive Board, UNESCO document 120 EX/9 of 27 August 1984.

38/ "Report of the Temporary Committee of the Executive Board responsible for reviewing the functioning of the Organisation", Executive Board, UNESCO document 120 EX/3 of 3 October 1984.

39/ "Evaluation activities implemented in 1984-1985", Executive Board, UNESCO document 122 EX/5 of 12 August 1985.

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

40/ "Design and evaluation: A manual of policies, procedures and guidelines for UNIDO-executed projects and programmes: Volume I - Projects", Division of Policy Co-ordination, UNIDO document UNIDO/PC.31/Rev. 1 of 25 May 1984.

41/ "Evaluation: A report on evaluation activities: Prepared by the Secretariat", Industrial Development Board, Permanent Committee, UNIDO document ID/B/C.3/129 of 21 September 1984.

World Food Programme (WFP)

42/ "Review of proposals for improvement of WFP's project cycle", Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes, WFP document WFP/CFA: 17/10 of April 1986.

World Health Organisation (WHO)

43/ "Managerial process for national health development: Guiding principles", "Health for All" series, no. 5, WHO, Geneva, 1981.

44/ "Health programme evaluation: Guiding principles", "Health for All" series, no. 6, WHO, Geneva, 1981.

45/ "The managerial process for WHO's programme development", WHO document MPWDP/81.1 of 27 July 1981.

46/ "Evaluation of the special programme for research and training in tropical diseases: Report of the External Review Committee to review the first five years of the special programme's operations", Executive Board, WHO, document EP71/6 of 4 November 1982.

47/ "Evaluating the strategies for health for all by the year 2000: Common framework and format". WHO document DGO/84.1, Geneva, 31 January 1984.

World Bank

48/ "Tenth annual review of project performance audit results 1984", World Bank, Washington D.C., 1985 .-

49/ "Annual report on operations evaluation", Report no. 5247, Operations Evaluation Department, August 30, 1984.

THIRD REPORT ON EVALUATION IN THE  
UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: INTEGRATION AND USEPrepared by Earl D. Sohm  
Joint Inspection Unit

## SUMMARY

In 1977 the JIU reported on renewed interest in evaluation to improve organizational performance in the United Nations system, and in 1981 on actions taken to develop evaluation systems and begin using them. In 1982 the ACC cited evaluation as an "essential and integral" part of "an overall management development effort", and the General Assembly affirmed continuing support for evaluation efforts in each agency. This report reviews current progress in integrating and using evaluation (Chapter I).

Evaluation is now being actively used in a more systematic way in almost all organizations, particularly through built-in self-evaluation but for in-depth programme evaluations as well. Central evaluation units remain very small (on average only 2.1/2 professional staff each) despite increased workloads. These units have generally performed well, but on average spend half their time doing in-depth studies and reporting, leaving little time available for evaluation system oversight and support and for the considerable expansion of system coverage which is still needed (Chapter II).

The organizations have given increasing attention to integrating evaluation into their decision-making processes. However, the emphasis on programme inputs still overshadows concern with results, design improvement responsibilities and actions are not clear, and training to build staff understanding and capabilities organization-wide is still relatively weak. More positively, computerized information systems offer new opportunities to improve performance information, and management review processes focus more and more on efficiency and management systems (Chapter III).

Built-in self-evaluation systems have helped clarify and harmonize evaluation methods, and efforts are underway to establish appropriate methods for various types of in-depth evaluation. The organizations need to maintain clear standards to ensure evaluation quality (Chapter IV).

Many organizations have begun modernizing and streamlining their internal feedback processes, and evaluation reporting to governing bodies has been widely established. Long-term development efforts are needed to ensure that timely, relevant information on performance is provided to meet programme decision-making needs organization-wide (Chapter V).

The organizations have become much more active in support of evaluation by governments, but resources are still quite modest relative to pressing administrative capacity needs. Actions are underway to better harmonize inter-agency evaluation activities, and the outlines of an international evaluation network are gradually beginning to emerge (Chapter VI).

The growing evaluation experience provides many patterns of substantive use to improve operations, "evaluations of evaluation", and steadily growing demand from secretariat and governing body users. Yet much remains to be done to further develop evaluation, firmly integrate it, and realize its full value to adapt and improve organizational operations to better meet the needs of Member States (Chapter VII).

Evaluation is demonstrating its value and being used more widely than ever before in the system, at a time when the organizations' tasks are also more challenging than ever. Each organization should work steadily to improve performance information through expanded evaluation coverage and strengthened design, monitoring, and training efforts, and provide evaluation quality control, appropriate co-operative efforts, and adequate central evaluation unit staffing (Chapter VIII).

-----