ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

119th meeting
Geneva, 16 December 2021

Item 10

Informal Document 2021/35

UNECE Evaluation Policy

(for approval)

UNECE Evaluation Policy

1. Introduction

In his report on *Shifting the management paradigm in the United Nations* (A/72/492), which the General Assembly took note of in its resolution 72/266, the Secretary-General signaled its intention to strengthen the evaluation capacity of the Secretariat to better inform programme planning and reporting on programme performance. In August 2021, the Under-Secretary-General for Management Strategy, Policy and Compliance (DMSPC) issued the administrative instruction *Evaluation in the United Nations Secretariat* (ST/AI/2021/3), describing the Organization's requirements and procedures for the management, conduct and use of evaluations and setting out the operational guidelines for article VII, Evaluation, of the *Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation* (ST/SGB/2018/3)

The central function of evaluation to improve programme performance, promote organizational learning and support accountability, was also reflected in the decisions from the Commission structuring the organization of UNECE to date: (a) the workplan on reform of ECE in 2005[1], and (b) the outcome of the review of the 2005 reform of ECE in 2013[2].

The present policy updates the 2014 policy, reflecting the latest mandates on evaluation. Beyond ST/SGB/2018/3 and ST/AI/2021/3, it is based on the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*[3] and builds on the guidance from the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) as set forth in its 2021 report on *strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives* (A/76/69).

2. Concept of Evaluation in the UN and in UNECE

As noted in Regulation 7.1 of ST/SGB/2018/3, the objective of evaluation is: (a) to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the Organization's activities in relation to their objectives; and (b) to enable the Secretariat and Member States to engage in systematic reflection, with a view to increasing the effectiveness of the main programmes of the Organization by altering their content and, if necessary, reviewing their objectives.

Consistent with para. 1.4 of ST/AI/2021/3, the term "evaluation" used in the present policy refers both to evaluation undertaken by oversight bodies and to internal evaluation (conducted by UNECE of its own work), referenced and defined in section VII of ST/SGB/2018/3 as "self-

---

[1] E/ECE/1434/Rev.1, para. 97
[2] E/ECE/1464, Annex III, para. 26
[3] UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)

evaluation". Section 4 of this policy provides additional details regarding the types of evaluations conducted at UNECE.

Complementary to Regulation 7.1 of ST/SGB/2018/3, UNECE uses in its internal evaluations some or all of the following evaluation criteria[4]:

- *Relevance*: is the intervention doing the right things?
- *Coherence*: how well does the intervention fit?
- *Effectiveness*: is the intervention achieving its objectives?
- *Efficiency*: how well are resources being used?
- *Impact*: what difference does the intervention make?
- *Sustainability*: will the benefits last?

As noted in Regulation 7.2 of ST/SGB/2018/3, evaluation is mandatory in the UN Secretariat. It is an integral part of results-based management (RBM) programming.[5] While RBM assesses *whether* results have been achieved, evaluation explores *why* and *how* they were achieved or not achieved, by providing measurable evidence of an activity, project, programme, subprogramme, strategy, policy, theme or institutional performance against the above-mentioned criteria.

3. Purpose of evaluation in UNECE

UNECE evaluations serve as a source of evidence of achievements in the past and an agent of change in the future. In particular, UNECE evaluations aim to:

(i) *Promote organizational learning*, by identifying lessons learned and best practices;
(ii) *Contribute to improvement of programme or project performance*, as progress towards and achievement of results, including by contributing to senior leadership decision-making;
(iii) *Ensure accountability* of the Secretariat to member States, senior leadership, donors, and beneficiaries.

In resolution 64/259[6], the General Assembly decided that accountability shall be defined as follows:

- Accountability is the obligation of the Secretariat and its staff members to be answerable for all decisions made and actions taken by them, and to be responsible for honouring their commitments, without qualification or exception.
- Accountability includes achieving objectives and high-quality results in a timely and cost-effective manner, in fully implementing and delivering on all mandates to the Secretariat approved by the United Nations intergovernmental bodies and other subsidiary organs established by them in compliance with all resolutions, regulations, rules and ethical standards; truthful, objective, accurate and timely reporting on performance results; responsible stewardship of funds and resources; all aspects of performance, including a clearly defined system of rewards and sanctions; and with due recognition to the important role of the oversight bodies and in full compliance with accepted recommendations.

---

[4] 2019 OECD DAC Revised Evaluation Criteria
[5] As referred to in para. 57 of A/72/492
[6] resolution 64/59, para. 8

The value of UNECE evaluations is determined by:

(i)   the *relevance* of evaluations in terms of their importance and timing;

(ii)   the *credibility* of evaluations which is determined by their independence and impartiality and quality;

(iii)   the *acceptance of recommendations* by the stakeholders; and

(iv)   the *appropriateness of the management response* to evaluations' recommendations.

4. Types of Evaluations in UNECE

There are two types of evaluations in the UNECE: (a) external evaluation or evaluation in which the evaluation function is located externally, i.e. outside UNECE and (b) internal evaluation in which the evaluation function is located internally, i.e. within the UNECE.

(a) External Evaluation

External evaluations of UNECE are managed and conducted by independent UN oversight bodies such as the Office for Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU). These evaluations have either a broad thematic scope (thematic evaluations) or address issues of strategic importance (strategic evaluations) for the Organization (in case of OIOS) or the entire United Nations system (in case of JIU). The results of these evaluations are reported to the General Assembly and the implementation of the recommendations from these oversight bodies is monitored.

External evaluations of extrabudgetary (XB) projects of traditional (OECD/DAC) donors are usually determined by their evaluation policies. Such evaluations are normally managed by a development agency and conducted by an independent team of consultants or a consultancy firm. To this end, sufficient resources are budgeted at the planning stage, to conduct a credible and independent evaluation at any stage of the project.

(b) Internal Evaluation

UNECE conducts four internal evaluations per biennium: three at the subprogramme level, and one at the programme level; programme and subprogrammes being understood with reference to Programme 17 (Economic development in Europe) of the programme plan approved each year by the General Assembly. Programme level evaluations look at cross-cutting issue or topic relevant to most of the subprogrammes. These four internal evaluations are reflected in the Annual Evaluation Plan approved by the Executive Committee and the General Assembly through the Proposed programme budget.

All projects funded from the UN Development Account and extrabudgetary projects with a budget at or above USD 250,000 are additionally subject to internal evaluations.

5. Evaluation Norms at UNECE

UNECE norms for evaluation derive from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*[7] adapted to the context and mandates of UNECE.

(a) Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets

At UNECE, it is the responsibility of evaluation managers and evaluators to uphold and promote, in their evaluation practice, the principles and values to which the United Nations is committed. In particular, they should respect, promote and contribute to the goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development[8].

Other internationally agreed goals and targets, relevant for UNECE evaluations as appropriate, include but are not limited to:

      (i) the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities[9] as well as resolution 74/144[10] and previous relevant resolutions on this matter;
      (ii) the Paris Climate Agreement of 2015[11];
      (iii) the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030[12];
      (iv) the Vienna Programme of Action for Landlocked Developing Countries[13]; and
      (v) South-South and Triangular cooperation as defined in resolution 75/234[14].

(b) Utility

As established by UNEG, in commissioning and conducting an evaluation, there should be a clear intention to use the resulting analysis, conclusions or recommendations to inform decisions and actions. The utility of evaluation is manifest through its use in making relevant and timely contributions to organizational learning, informed decision-making processes and accountability for results. Evaluations could also be used to contribute beyond the organization by generating knowledge and empowering stakeholders.

At UNECE, utility is embodied in two exercises: the *Annual Exchange of Experience on Evaluations*, and the *Annual report on Evaluation.*

(c) Credibility

As established by UNEG, credibility is grounded on independence, impartiality and a rigorous methodology. Key elements of credibility include transparent evaluation processes, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Evaluation results (or findings) and recommendations are derived from — or informed by — the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data

---

[7] UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)
[8] Resolution 70/1
[9] Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
[10] Resolution 74/144
[11] Paris Climate Agreement of 2015
[12] Resolution 69/283
[13] Resolution 69/137, complemented by resolution 74/15
[14] Resolution 75/234

and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.

Credibility requires that evaluations are ethically conducted and managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competencies.

(d) Independence

As established by UNEG, independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility, influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process.

The UNECE framework for evaluation is provided in section 6 of this policy; it is commensurate to the size of UNECE, while ensuring to the extent possible the independence of the evaluation function. The evaluation is carried out by the Programme Management Unit (PMU) under the guidance of its Chief and the overall supervision of the Director of the Programme Management and Support Services Division (PMSSD), designated Evaluation Head, reporting directly to the Executive Secretary of UNECE. The role of the PMU is to ensure overall coordination of all aspects of programme management: planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation. The PMU is separate from other management functions to ensure, to the extent possible, independence and full discretion in the management of evaluations and selection of evaluators.

(e) Impartiality

As established by UNEG, the key elements of impartiality are objectivity, professional integrity and absence of bias. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including planning an evaluation, formulating the mandate and scope, selecting the evaluation team, providing access to stakeholders, conducting the evaluation and formulating findings and recommendations.

Evaluators need to be impartial, implying that evaluation team members must not have been (or expect to be in the near future) directly responsible for the policy setting, design or management of the evaluation subject.

(f) Ethics

As established by UNEG, evaluation must be conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect for the beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environment; for human rights and gender equality; and for the 'do no harm' principle for humanitarian assistance. Evaluators must respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, must ensure that sensitive data is protected and that it cannot be traced to its source and must validate statements made in the report with those who provided the relevant information. Evaluators should obtain informed consent for the use of private information from those who provide it. When evidence of wrongdoing is uncovered, it must be reported discreetly to a competent body (such as the relevant office of audit or investigation).

(g) Transparency

As established by UNEG, transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability. UNECE evaluation products are publicly accessible.

(h) Human rights, gender equality and disability inclusion

As established by UNEG, the universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators and evaluation managers to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind'.

In compliance with the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy [15], disability inclusion is also mainstreamed effectively throughout evaluation process and reflected in the terms of reference and evaluation reports.

(i) National evaluation capacities

As established by UNEG, the effective use of evaluation can make valuable contributions to accountability and learning and thereby justify actions to strengthen national evaluation capacities. In line with General Assembly resolution 69/237[16] on building capacity for the evaluation of development activities at the country level, national evaluation capacities should be supported upon the request of Member States.

(j) Professionalism

As established by UNEG, evaluations should be conducted with professionalism and integrity. Professionalism should contribute towards the credibility of evaluators, evaluation managers and evaluation heads, as well as the evaluation function. Key aspects include access to knowledge; education and training; adherence to ethics and to these norms and standards; utilization of evaluation competencies; and recognition of knowledge, skills and experience. This should be supported by an enabling environment, institutional structures and adequate resources.

(k) Enabling environment

At UNECE, evaluation is a basis for accountability, learning and evidence-based decision-making. The following factors contribute to the enabling environment: (i) the commitment to evaluation in the Compact of the Executive Secretary; (ii) the Annual report on evaluations presented to ECE Executive Committee (EXCOM) summarizing the progress on implementation of evaluation recommendations; (iii) the Annual Evaluation Plans with evaluations funded from the regular budget are approved by EXCOM; (iv) the threshold of $250,000 above which all extrabudgetary projects should budget 2% for evaluation.

---

[15] UN Disability Inclusion Strategy
[16] Resolution 69/237

(l) Evaluation policy

At UNECE, the evaluation policy includes: (i) a clear explanation of the purpose, concepts, rules and use of evaluation; (ii) the institutional framework, roles and responsibilities; (iii) the measures to safeguard evaluation independence and public accountability; (iv) the benchmarks for financing the evaluation function that are commensurate with the size and function of UNECE; and (v) the measures to ensure the quality and the use of evaluations and post-evaluation follow-up.

At UNECE, the evaluation policy is approved by ECE Executive Committee. The policy is periodically reviewed and updated at the discretion of the Evaluation Head or at the request of the Executive Committee.

(m) Responsibility for the evaluation function

At UNECE, the responsibility for the evaluation function is detailed in section 6 of the evaluation policy.

(n) Evaluation use and follow-up

At UNECE, evaluation use and follow-up are detailed in section 10 of the evaluation policy.

6. UNECE Institutional Framework for Evaluation

The Commission is responsible for providing strategic guidance and ensuring sound governance of UNECE.[17] As the inter-sessional governing body of the Commission, the Executive Committee approves UNECE's Evaluation Policy and UNECE Annual Evaluation Plan.

The **Executive Secretary** is responsible for fostering an enabling environment for evaluation and ensuring that:
-   the UNECE evaluation is adequately resourced and budgeted,
-   the UNECE evaluations integrate gender equality and disability inclusion in evaluation procedures and practices;
-   the UNECE evaluations are conducted in an independent and impartial way;
-   an appropriate quality assurance system for evaluation is in place;
-   the UNECE evaluations contribute to evidence-based decision-making, programme management and organizational learning;
-   the UNECE evaluation findings are made available to all stakeholders, other parts of the UN Secretariat and the public;
-   all follow-up measures to UNECE evaluations as agreed in the management responses are implemented;
-   joint evaluations with other Secretariat entities on cross-cutting areas are conducted when appropriate

---

[17] E/ECE/778/Rev.5 Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Economic Commission for Europe

The commitment of the Executive Secretary to evaluation is reflected in the Senior Management Compact, and cascades down to all staff through the Performance document of the senior managers.[18]

The **Director of the Programme Management and Support Services Division (PMSSD)**, reporting directly to the Executive Secretary is the designated Evaluation Head[19] at UNECE. To ensure no real or perceived conflict of interest, the Director PMSSD oversees the Programme Management Unit in charge of managing evaluations but is not involved in the direct management of evaluations, in particular the clearance of the final evaluation report and final management responses.

The **Programme Management Unit (PMU)** supports the Executive Secretary and the Director, PMSSD in their efforts to ensure the consistent application of evaluation norms and standards across UNECE. The evaluation function is fulfilled by the Chief, PMU and the Programme Management Officer P-4[20]. In particular, the PMU:
- Ensures that UNECE evaluation policies, guidelines and templates reflect mandates and meet requirements for evaluation from the UN General Assembly and other relevant bodies;
- Coordinates the development and implementation of the UNECE Annual Evaluation Plan, funded from the regular budget, approved by ECE Executive Committee[21] and the General Assembly through the Proposed programme budget;
- Manages all internal evaluations conducted in UNECE,
- Conducts quality assurance to ensure that the guidance from the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) is integrated at all stages of the evaluation process;
- Acts as a focal point for all external evaluations of UNECE;
- Monitors and reports on the implementation of recommendations from external evaluations and internal evaluations;
- Organizes workshops and training on evaluation, disseminates best evaluation practices of other UN entities in UNECE;
- Organizes an *Annual Exchange of Experience on Evaluations*, as detailed in section 10 of this policy;
- Selects consultant evaluators with relevant background to understand UNECE programme and projects, working experience and evaluation competencies from the Inspira roster managed by DMSPC or some other source;
- Prepares an *Annual report on Evaluation*[22], as detailed in section 10 of this policy;
- Maintains a database of recommendations and Open UNECE website[23] on evaluation, as detailed in section 10 of this policy; and
- Contributes to the development of UN evaluation policies and tools through UNEG, OIOS and DMSPC.

---

[18] UNECE Accountability Framework (2012)
[19] Pursuant to para. 20.181 of A/75/6(Sect.20) approved in resolution 75/252
[20] Pursuant to para. 20.20 of A/72/6(Sect.20) approved in resolution 72/261
[21] https://unece.org/evaluation-plans
[22] https://unece.org/evaluation-annual-reports
[23] https://unece.org/evaluation-reports

With respect to evaluation, **the Divisions:**
- Ensure that internal evaluations of extrabudgetary projects and UN Development Account projects are properly budgeted and adequately resourced;
- Process and manage the consultancy contract of the evaluators upon selection by PMU;
- Process the payments of the evaluator, upon agreed timelines in the Terms of Reference and final clearance from PMU for the final payment;
- Ensure that evaluators are given access to all relevant information and stakeholders on the subject of the evaluation;
- Are responsible to contribute to the quality of internal evaluations, by signaling to PMU the errors in the draft evaluation reports and providing the necessary evidence for the evaluator to address the issue;
- Ensure the proper disclosure and dissemination of internal evaluations at the subprogramme level;
- Ensure that the results of the internal evaluations contribute at the subprogramme level to the three goals stated in section 3 of this policy;
- Report on the results of internal evaluations at the subprogramme level to the Sectoral Committees;
- Prepare a formal management response to all internal evaluations for signature by Division director; and
- Ensure effective follow-up to evaluations at the subprogramme level and integration of recommendations into future planning processes, as detailed in section 10 of this policy and specified in ST/SGB/2018/3, rule 107.4.

7. Resources for UNECE internal evaluations

The staff supporting evaluations in the PMU and in the divisions are funded from the regular budget or from extrabudgetary sources in case of internal evaluation of extrabudgetary projects. All internal evaluations are managed by ECE staff and conducted by consultant/s, to ensure their impartiality in the actual conduct of the evaluation.

The consultancies for the internal evaluations included in the Annual Evaluation Plan, approved by the Executive Committee and the General Assembly through the Proposed programme budget, are funded from the regular budget (Sections 20 and 35).

At least 2% of the budget of extrabudgetary projects and 4% of the budget of UN Development Account projects should be set aside at the planning stage, to engage a consultant for conducting the internal evaluation upon the completion of the project.

In exceptional circumstances and upon approval of the Executive Secretary, internal evaluation resources of extrabudgetary projects can be pooled together to enhance the quality and use of the evaluation.

In addition to consultancy and staff costs related to evaluation in the regular budget, the Executive Secretary and subprogrammes can mobilize extra budgetary and in-kind resources from donors for conducting internal evaluations.

8. Planning of UNECE internal evaluations

As part of the annual planning and budget process, UNECE prepares an *Annual Evaluation Plan* based on the annual risk register and relevant themes.[24] The theme for the programme level internal evaluation is selected by the Executive Secretary and approved by the Executive Committee. The themes for internal evaluations at the subprogramme level are selected by Divisions in consultation with Sectoral Committees. Each UNECE subprogramme should be evaluated every six years.

The *Annual Evaluation Plan* is approved by the Executive Committee in December each year, alongside with the review of the Proposed programme budget.

A *Tentative Schedule of UNDA and extrabudgetary projects for* internal *evaluation* is also included in the Annual Evaluation report submitted to the Executive Committee.

9. Conducting internal evaluations in UNECE

Internal evaluations are designed and conducted in accordance with ST/SGB/2018/3, ST/AI/2021/3, and builds on the guidance from the OIOS as set forth in its biennial report on evaluation. The UNECE Evaluation Policy is complemented by the UNEG *Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System* [25], the UNEG *Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation*[26], and the *UN Development Account Project Evaluation Guidelines*[27].

The Terms of Reference for internal evaluations should meet UNEG requirements. They should be cleared by the Directors of Divisions and approved by PMU on behalf of the Executive Secretary before the issuance of a contract to the independent consultant (the 'evaluator') by the Executive Office.

As established by UNEG, evaluation methodologies must be sufficiently rigorous such that the evaluation responds to the scope and objectives, is designed to answer evaluation questions and leads to a complete, fair and unbiased assessment[28]. The following data collection methodologies should be considered when conducting any evaluation in UNECE: (a) Desk review of all relevant documentation and secondary data analysis; (b) Self-administered surveys; (c) Semi-structured interviews and focus groups; (d) Direct observation of workshops and e) any other method as deemed relevant to the evaluation objective and scope. Triangulation and evaluation matrixes are underlying principles of any evaluation conducted at UNECE.

As established by UNEG[29], inclusive and diverse stakeholder engagement in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations is critical to ensure ownership, relevance, credibility and the use of evaluation. To the extent possible, stakeholder engagement mechanisms are encouraged, such as the use of an Evaluation Committee overseeing the key milestones of extrabudgetary or

---

[24] https://unece.org/governance-framework
[25] UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System
[26] UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation
[27] UN Development Account Project Evaluation Guidelines
[28] UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016), Standard 4.5
[29] UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016), Standard 4.6

UNDA projects internal evaluations and comprising one external stakeholder involved in the project.

The independent consultant must be selected on the basis of UNEG core competencies and ethical guidelines [30] in a competitive process, to ensure credibility, as well as independence and impartiality of evaluation. Evaluators must have an understanding of integration of gender, human rights and disability in the evaluation. The competitive process takes place between evaluators selected from the Inspira roster of evaluators, managed by DMSPC, or from some other source.

The PMU oversees the quality control at the final stage of evaluation in full compliance with UNEG Standard 5.3[31], with roles for PMU and the divisions, as outlined in section 6 of this policy.

10. Follow-up to evaluations in UNECE

As a follow-up to evaluations, the Secretariat prepares a *management response*.[32] The management response should aim to strengthen evaluation, increase stakeholder and management buy-in, ensure action and facilitate organizational learning. A management response is produced for all evaluations conducted in UNECE and forms an integral part of the final evaluation report.

The management response clearly states whether UNECE accepts, partially accepts (only for internal evaluations), or rejects recommendations. Where a recommendation is rejected, a detailed justification is required. The management response indicates the timeframe, specific actions and designated functional title or unit responsible for each action.

The management response should be completed within two months from completion of the final evaluation report. All management responses in UNECE are approved by directors on behalf of the Executive Secretary. the PMU ensures that management responses are compliant with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets, as defined *inter alia* in section 5) a) of this policy.

In June and December each year, upon instructions from the PMU, divisions complete *Progress reports* monitoring progress made on implementing accepted recommendations from internal evaluations. This process ends when sufficient evidence is provided to enable the closure of the recommendation as implemented. By default, recommendations from internal evaluations are closed after two years without implementation. The *Annual Evaluation report* prepared by the PMU consolidates all recommendations implemented and closed without implementation each year.

An Annual Exchange of Experience on Evaluations is organized by the PMU at the beginning of each year, with the purpose to draw lessons from internal evaluations conducted the previous year and facilitate an exchange of experiences across the organization. A report is produced by the PMU and circulated to division directors. The key conclusions are subsequently summarized and presented in the *Annual report on Evaluation* presented to the Executive Committee for

---

[30] In compliance with UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016), Standard 3
[31] UNEG, Standard 5.3
[32] UNEG Standard 1.4

information.

The PMU also maintains a database of all recommendations formulated, related management responses and actions taken until closure and implementation, to feed UNECE knowledge management system and contribute to the three goals of evaluation as stated in section 3 of this policy.

11. Disclosure and Dissemination of UNECE evaluations

UNECE is accountable to UN and UNECE member States for the achievement of its objectives, expected accomplishments and activities. As a public international organization, all Terms of Reference, Evaluation reports, Management responses, and Progress reports are available on the UNECE public website since 1 May 2014.

Should the contents of an evaluation report contain sensitive information, an executive summary of the evaluation report and the management response will be made public while the full report will be provided to UNECE member States upon request. The reports will also be hosted on the OIOS Evaluation Knowledge Management Platform.

12. Collaboration with other entities on evaluation

UNECE is a member of UNEG, using its norms and standards, as reflected in the present policy.

Within the UN Secretariat, UNECE coordinates primarily on evaluation with the other Regional Commissions (UNECA, UNECLAC, UNESCAP, UNESCWA) through the Network of the Chiefs of Programme Planning (NCPP). In 2012, all Regional Commissions jointly established an interregional monitoring and evaluation network with the overall purpose of ensuring effective communication and information-sharing across regional commissions on the use and practice of monitoring and evaluation in each organization. UNECE also coordinates actively with UNDESA and other entities from the development pillar to prepare the internal evaluations of Development Account projects.

In accordance with ST/SGB/2018/3 and ST/AI/2021/3, UNECE also collaborates actively on evaluation with the Inspection and Evaluation Division of OIOS and the Business Transformation and Accountability Division of DMSPC.

Finally, in addition to its current participation in evaluation networks across the UN, UNECE also plans to continue widening its cooperation on evaluation to further networks and associations outside the UN system, in the UNECE region and globally.

———