International
Labour
Office

Geneva

October 2009

Terms of Reference
of the Independent External Evaluation of ILO's Evaluation Function

INTRODUCTION

As mandated by the Governing Body, the ILO will launch an Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of its evaluation function in 2010. (Evaluation function refers to evaluation structures, processes, and activities.) When the new policy and strategic framework for evaluation in ILO was agreed at the November 2005 meeting of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee (PFAC)[1], an evaluation of this new policy and strategy was signalled to take place after five years. Subsequently, the PFAC of the November 2008 Governing Body, noted and welcomed the proposed IEE. There have already been some reviews of the work of the ILO's central evaluation unit (EVAL), including a self-assessment carried out in 2005[2], and external reviews in 2006-07 by the Independent Steering Committee for the Comprehensive Review of Governance and Oversight within the UN System, a report of the US Government Accountability Office, and the One World Trust Global Accountability Report.[3]

The IEE will focus on the evaluation function within the Organization, taking the 2005 evaluation policy and strategic framework as well as the establishment of EVAL, as the starting point and working towards understanding how the evaluation system operates at the various levels, in order to review its quality and effectiveness in light of the objectives of the Organisation and the appropriate international standards. The most important rationale for and objective of the IEE is to "look ahead" and provide recommendations so that strategic decisions for the future of evaluation in ILO can be made. This is particularly relevant in the context of the goals and priorities of the new Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalisation and ILO's continuing commitment to RBM, which relies on links between monitoring and evaluation, policy formation and budgeting.

BACKGROUND TO THE EVALUATION FUNCTION IN ILO

EVAL was created in March 2005 within the Management and Administration Sector. It has overall responsibility for implementing the ILO's evaluation policy and is charged with submitting its evaluation reports directly to the Director-General. It now has a Director, three

---

[1] ILO: A new policy and strategic framework for evaluation in the ILO, GB.294/PFA/8/4; paragraph 46.

[2] A self-assessment survey among members of the United Nations evaluation Group (UNEG) conducted to review compliance with UNEG norms and standards. This exercise may provide the IEE with useful baseline data and information.

[3] ILO: Annual Evaluation Report 2006, September 2007, pages 13-15.

evaluation officers and a knowledge management officer, as well as interns as the work load demands. Working to internationally accepted norms and standards inside and outside the United Nations system (being principally those of the UN Evaluation Group and of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD), the evaluation policy aimed to improve and strengthen the practice of independent evaluation in the ILO and establish principles for systematic self-evaluation of programme performance to together provide comprehensive coverage of all ILO activities to support the ILO's objectives as laid out in the Strategic Policy Framework (SPF) and the Programme and Budget documents.

The objectives of the new ILO Evaluation Policy were:

- Improve Office-wide transparency and accountability for impact of ILO actions to support its constituents;

- Strengthen the decision making process by the policy organs and senior management based on sound assessment of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of ILO actions; and

- Contribute feedback for learning and ongoing improvement of the ILO's work.

The operational framework of the policy is intended to ensure transparency and independence of the evaluation function. The framework serves different needs and is aimed at different levels to align with major programming and resourcing processes in the Office. Responsibility for implementation of some of the evaluation types was to lie within line management structures (self evaluation), while others were to be managed by evaluation focal persons in sectors and regions, with oversight provided by an independent central evaluation unit.

The evaluation function is characterised by four different types of evaluations:

- **First,** evaluations of ILO strategies were to focus on particular outcomes of major strategies or policies established in the Programme and Budget[4]. Since 2005, five strategy evaluations have been carried out to assess their effectiveness, efficiency, impact and continued strategic relevance[5]. A sixth study, of national capacity development of member States to develop policies and programmes focused on youth employment, is in progress.

- **Second,** independent country programme evaluations were proposed as a means of systematically reviewing progress and the relevance of country level work to national constituents and partners. To date, five have been completed and two are underway[6].
- **Third**, thematic evaluations provided a means for ILO technical programmes to explore in depth the effectiveness and impact of major means of actions. Largely, EVAL has provided advisory support to ILO technical programmes for conducting and resourcing thematic evaluations.

---

[4] Programme and Budget covered: 2000-2001, 2002-2003, 2004-2005, 2006-2007, and 2008-2009.

[5] These are: i) the InFocus Programme on Social Dialogue, Labour Law and Labour Administration; ii) the In Focus Programme on Socio-Economic Security; iii) the Strategy for Employment Creation through Employment Intensive Investment; iv) the Strategy to support members' States to improve the impact of International Labour Standard; and v) the Strategy for the protection of migrant workers.

[6] These evaluations have been carried out in Argentina, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Philippines, Ukraine and Zambia, with studies currently underway in Honduras and Indonesia.

- **Fourth,** with ILO independent project evaluations, EVAL has provided support and oversight as required for these evaluations in the Office. About 160 in the period 2005-2007, both mid-term and final reports, have been carried out, with over half of these having been independently appraised for quality and credibility.

In addition, the evaluation function supports the Office in carrying out self evaluations including country programme reviews, organizational reviews and project-level self evaluations.

Core to the evaluation policy and strategy was the creation of a central evaluation unit, which was tasked to instil a culture of accountability and learning through evaluation. It was to establish an Office-wide evaluation network, and to facilitate progress towards harmonizing evaluation policies and practices, including monitoring of adherence; developing rules and guidance on for ILO evaluations; improve coherence and complementarity between evaluations; facilitate the generation and use of evaluation information; and develop networks, visibility and credibility for the ILO in the area of evaluation.

Since the policy's adoption, the ILO's evaluation function has been further strengthened through the release of an Office Directive specifying the authority and responsibilities of EVAL and, regular submission of an Annual Evaluation Report to the Governing Body, which provides an overview of evaluation activities and evaluation performance within ILO, covering all types and levels of evaluations. An internal Evaluation Advisory Committee to oversee and promote institutional follow-up to evaluation recommendations has been established. The Office has developed tools and guidance for monitoring and self evaluation, as well as conducting targeted training, as a means of improving the learning function of evaluation activities.

A close connection exists between the evaluation function and the results-based management framework, with the former providing lessons learned information for the latter. EVAL has been carrying out quality appraisals of the independent project evaluation reports as part of its reporting to the Governing Body. A data base has been developed to monitor and track project evaluations. This database is also the means of developing a composite schedule of upcoming evaluations, and documenting follow up to evaluations. Finally, full time regional evaluation officers have been now been appointed after a period of part-time evaluation focal points.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of the IEE is to provide an independent assessment of the evaluation function within the ILO to provide recommendations on the future strategy for evaluation. The evaluators will examine effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the current arrangements and structures for the evaluation function within ILO, learning from the implementation experiences, and in light of international best practices including the UNEG[7] Norms and Standards. In particular, the IEE will examine the extent to which the evaluation function in the ILO has made progress in implementing the evaluation function with respect to the UNEG Norms[8]. Based on the UNEG Norms, a set of criteria clustered around the three

---

[7] The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) is a professional network that brings together the units responsible for evaluation in the UN system including the specialized agencies, funds, programmes and affiliated organisations. UNEG aims to strengthen the objectivity, effectiveness and visibility of the evaluation function across the UN system and to advocate the importance of evaluation for learning, decision making and accountability.

[8] The UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN system seek to ensure that evaluation functions within the UN follow agreed-upon basic principles. They provide a reference for strengthening, professionalizing and improving the quality of evaluation

issues of independence, credibility and utility should form the normative framework for this evaluation exercise (see Annex 1).

The IEE will cover the period from the initiation of the ILO evaluation policy and strategic framework in 2005 through 2009. Analysis will involve consideration of both centralised and decentralised operations, including those of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour's evaluation section, and the regional evaluation specialists.

The principle client for the IEE is the Governing Body, which is responsible for governance-level decisions on the findings and recommendations of this evaluation. Other key stakeholders include the ILO Director-General and members of the Senior Management Team, Regional Directors and ILO donors.

The IEE will examine the following aspects:

- the quality of the evaluation function in the ILO, with regard to its independence credibility and the usefulness of its products and services, particularly for learning and accountability purposes, as assessed against international norms and standards;

- structural aspects of the evaluation function in the ILO;

- EVAL's mandate, scope and work, including its relationships to the various evaluation operations within the ILO, and respective roles and utility of centralised and decentralised evaluation activities as well as of independent evaluations and self evaluations;

- the nature of the reporting arrangements internally to the Evaluation Advisory Committee and externally to the Governing Body;

- the extent to which the evaluation function and responsibilities are meeting the needs of tripartite constituents and supporting the ILO governance process;

- the extent to which ILO evaluations respect UNEG Norms and Standards and relationships with evaluation units and mechanisms within the United Nation system, donor agencies, and other relevant evaluation networks;

- capacity and competencies for evaluation, and the use of evaluation techniques and methodologies;

- the extent to which the evaluation function contributes to informing the strategic directions, policies, programmes and projects of the ILO, including the focus on results-based management (RBM), and how to make it more effective in this respect; and

- the extent to which evaluation results are incorporated and used in follow-up activities and within the knowledge management strategies of the ILO, and disseminated to wider audiences.

Recommendations are to be made, inter alia, in relation to the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function in ILO, and how these might be improved, and the role and contribution of evaluation within the Strategic Policy Framework for 2010-2015, the Decent

---

in all entities of the United Nations system. The UNEG Standards build upon the Norms, and are intended to guide the establishment of the institutional framework, management of the evaluation function, conduct and use of evaluations.

Work Country Programmes and the follow-up to the new Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalisation. The IEE is also expected to provide a basis for improved accountability, learning of lessons, leadership and decision-making in the context of the ILO's continuing commitment to Results-Based Management (RBM). Although it is assumed that the evaluation recommendations will not translate into real increase in regular budget resources for the evaluation function, it is expected that any recommendations for change that would be made, will be fully costed and prioritized.

METHODOLOGY

In accordance with the ILO evaluation policy, participation of ILO tripartite constituents and both internal and external key stakeholders during all phases of the external evaluation process will be assured, as appropriate. This involvement will be based on suitable methodologies, focussing on interviews, consultation meetings, surveys, and document reviews.

A self-evaluation of the Office's evaluation function will be carried out by EVAL immediately prior to the IEE and included in the background documentation, the discussion of which would be part of the evaluation methodology.

The details of the methodology will be elaborated by the external evaluators on the basis of the Terms of Reference (TORs) and documented in an inception report. However, it is expected that the evaluation team will apply mixed methods which draw on both hard and soft evidence and involve multiple means of analysis. These could be:

- Review appropriate evaluation policy-related documentation including performance reports, budget information, internal governance documents, etc.

- Conduct an audit of current evaluation arrangements and practices using UN evaluation norms and standards as quality templates;

- Inventory the portfolio of evaluation work done since 2005, including the extent to which these have been managed according to ILO evaluation policy and guidelines.

- Review of a sample of evaluations reflecting regional diversity, centralised vs. decentralised reports, technical themes, and type (project, country programme, global strategy, thematic) against recognized evaluation report good practices;

- Review the electronic systems supporting the evaluation function to facilitate transparency, accountability and knowledge sharing;

- Review and discuss with relevant ILO officials the self-evaluation report carried out by EVAL;

- Review evidence of follow up to evaluation recommendations and use of lessons learned by ILO management;

- Interview key stakeholders reflecting a diversity of backgrounds inside the Office according to sector, technical unit, regions and country situations, and representing both subjects and users of evaluations;

- Interview stakeholders outside the Office, including Governing Body members (taking advantage of Governing Body meetings to do so), tripartite partners, and members of multilateral and bilateral partners;

- Carry out a series of electronic surveys both with Office staff and Governing Body members and prepare regional and country case studies, including based on visits to the regional offices and other field offices.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The IEE will be carried out by a team of senior evaluation consultants, experienced in similar exercises and independent from the ILO. The consultants will be selected through a competitive bidding process in accordance with normal ILO procurement procedures. An impartial panel will screen candidates based on relevant evaluation experience; independence (i.e. no current or past close working relationships with the ILO), familiarity with the ILO and its mandate, and understanding of UN evaluation norms and standards. A team of three consultants will be identified. Each member of the team is expected to be engaged for 20 working days. Bids will be invited from companies providing consultancy services. The call for bids would be published through various sources so as to attract a broad range of responses.

The ILO Office of Internal Audit and Oversight (IAO) will oversee the IEE process in order to maintain its independence. IAO's responsibilities are to provide the ILO Governing Body with assurance that the IEE was conducted independently and transparently, and that it complied with established procedures and standards, including with regard to the bidding process for the selection of evaluators and the Governing Body approved TOR. Specific responsibilities of IAO will include:

1. Review the work plan and terms of reference for the evaluators to ensure that it complies with the evaluation TOR approved by the Governing Body;

2. Review the competitive bidding process leading to the selection and contracting of the team of external evaluators to ensure that the process complies with established procedures;

3. Oversee the evaluation process, ensuring that the evaluators have access to the necessary materials and relevant staff, and other required facilities;

4. Review the draft evaluation report to ensure that it complies with the agreed TOR;

5. Be a focal point for ILO's management comments and response on the draft report; and

6. Provide oral or written feedback to the Governing Body on the independence, transparency and credibility of the process, including compliance with established rules and procedures.

The central Evaluation Unit, (EVAL) will provide support services to the IAO upon request, but will not be involved in the actual evaluation process.

OUTPUTS

The following written outputs will be produced:

- An inception report detailing initial findings and proposed methodology, including key questions to answer;

- A detailed draft evaluation report based on factual information and well reasoned judgement based on credible analysis of sources and documentation consulted;

- A final evaluation report to be posted on the ILO website and disseminated to key stakeholders; and

- A presentation of the executive summary to the Governing Body in November 2010.

PROVISIONAL PLAN OF WORK AND TIMETABLE

The proposed evaluation time frame is from December 2009 to August 2010. The final Terms of Reference for the IEE will be presented to the PFAC in November 2009.

Date	Events
July 2009	Evaluation Advisory Committee (internal) reviews and finalizes the draft TOR.
July – September 2009	Draft TOR circulated to GB representatives for comments.
November 2009	TOR presented to PFAC for approval.
December 2009	Launch of competitive bidding procedures.
December 2009	Self-evaluation report carried out by EVAL.
January-February 2010	Selection and contracting of Consultant Team.
March 2010	Oral progress report to PFAC by the Office.
May 2010	Inception report submitted by Consultant Team
August 2010	Circulation of draft report to key stakeholders for comments.
October 2010	Report Finalised and GB summary prepared.
November 2010	Presentation of IEE summary report to GB and public dissemination of full report through Internet.
November 2010	Office of Internal Audit and Oversight provides PFAC with an oral or written oversight feedback on evaluation process.
January 2011	Follow up action plan prepared.
March 2011	Follow up action plan presented to PFAC.

Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System[9]

Introduction

The UNEG Norms "seek to facilitate system-wide collaboration on evaluation by ensuring that evaluation entities within the UN follow agreed-upon basic principles. They provide a reference for strengthening, professionalizing and improving the quality of evaluation in all entities of the United Nations system. The norms are consistent with other main sources and reflect the singularity of the United Nations system, characterized by its focus on people and respect for their rights, the importance of international values and principles, universality and neutrality, its multiple stakeholders, its needs for global governance, its multidisciplinarity, and its complex accountability system".

The UNEG Norms are clustered here under three main aspects of evaluation: utility, independence and credibility. They have been organized to facilitate the focus of the IEE around these three categories of issues[10].

Utility of Centrally Produced Evaluations

N 1.1

1. Purposes of evaluation include understanding why and the extent to which intended and unintended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders.
2. Evaluation is an important source of evidence of the achievement of results and institutional performance.
3. Evaluation is also an important contributor to building knowledge and to organizational learning.
4. Evaluation is an important agent of change and plays a critical and credible role in supporting accountability.

N 1.3

1. Evaluation feeds into management and decision making processes, and makes an essential contribution to managing for results.
2. Evaluation informs the planning, programming, budgeting, implementation and reporting cycle.
3. It aims at improving the institutional relevance and the achievement of results, optimizing the use of resources, providing client satisfaction and maximizing the impact of the contribution of the UN system.

---

[9] Drawn from UNEG: Norms for Evaluation in the UN System; April 2005. Paragraph numbers relate to source of text for that norm. Descriptive material relating to evaluations is not included here, hence not all paragraphs are included.
[10] The original text can be found at : http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4.

N 1.5

1. Evaluation is not a decision-making process per se, but rather serves as an input to provide decision-makers with knowledge and evidence about performance and good practices.
2. Although evaluation is used to assess undertakings, it should provide value-added for decision-oriented processes to assist in the improvement of present and future activities, projects, programmes, strategies and policies.
3. Thus evaluation contributes to institutional policy-making, development effectiveness and organizational effectiveness.

N 1.7

1. Evaluation is therefore about 'are we doing the right thing'? It examines the rationale; the justification of the undertaking makes a reality check and looks at the satisfaction of intended beneficiaries.
2. Evaluation is also about 'are we doing it right'?
3. It assesses the effectiveness of achieving expected results.
4. It examines the efficiency of the use of inputs to yield results.
5. Finally, evaluation asks 'are there better ways of achieving the results'? Evaluation looks at alternative ways, good practices and lessons learned.

N 2.6

1. The Governing Bodies and/or Heads of organizations and of the evaluation functions are responsible for ensuring that evaluation contributes to decision making and management. They should ensure that a system is in place for explicit planning for evaluation and for systematic consideration of the findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in evaluations. They should ensure appropriate follow-up measures including an action plan, or equivalent appropriate tools, with clear accountability for the implementation of the approved recommendations.

N 2.7

1. The Governing Bodies and/or Heads of organizations and of the evaluation functions are responsible for ensuring that there is a repository of evaluations and a mechanism for distilling and disseminating lessons to improve organizational learning and systemic improvement. They should also make evaluation findings available to stakeholders and other organizations of the UN system as well as to the public.

N 4.1 (and Norm 4.2)

1. Proper application of the evaluation function implies that there is a clear intent to use evaluation findings.
2. In the context of limited resources, the planning and selection of evaluation work has to be carefully done.
3. Evaluations must be chosen and undertaken in a timely manner so that they can and do inform decision-making with relevant and timely information.
4. Planning for evaluation must be an explicit part of planning and budgeting of the evaluation function and/or the organization as a whole. Annual or multi-year evaluation work programmes should be made public.

N 4.2

1. The evaluation plan can be the result of a cyclical or purposive selection of evaluation topics.
2. The purpose, nature and scope of evaluation must be clear to evaluators and stakeholders.
3. The plan for conducting each evaluation must ensure due process to ascertain the timely completion of the mandate, and consideration of the most cost-effective way to obtain and analyse the necessary information.

N 10.1 & N 10.2

1. Transparency and consultation with the major stakeholders are essential features in all stages of the evaluation process. This improves the credibility and quality of the evaluation. It can facilitate consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.
2. Evaluation Terms of Reference and reports should be available to major stakeholders and be public documents. Documentation on evaluations in easily consultable and readable form should also contribute to both transparency and legitimacy.

N 12.1 – 12.3 (Follow-up)

1. Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and management addressed by its recommendations. This may take the form of a management response, action plan and/or agreement clearly stating responsibilities and accountabilities.
2. There should be a systematic follow-up on the implementation of the evaluation recommendations that have been accepted by management and/or the Governing Bodies.
3. There should be a periodic report on the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations. This report should be presented to the Governing Bodies and/or the Head of the organization.

N 13.1 – 13.2 (Contribution to Knowledge-building)

1. Evaluation contributes to knowledge building and organizational improvement.
2. Evaluations should be conducted and evaluation findings and recommendations presented in a manner that is easily understood by target audiences.
3. Evaluation findings and lessons drawn from evaluations should be accessible to target audiences in a user-friendly way. A repository of evaluations could be used to distil lessons that contribute to peer learning and the development of structured briefing material for the training of staff. This should be done in a way that facilitates the sharing of learning among stakeholders, including the organizations of the UN system, through a clear dissemination policy and contribution to knowledge networks.

Independence of Evaluations and Evaluation Systems

N 2.1 – 2.4 (Responsibility for Evaluation)

1. The Governing Bodies and/or the Heads of organizations in the UN system are responsible for fostering an enabling environment for evaluation and ensuring that the role and function of evaluation are clearly stated, reflecting the principles of the UNEG Norms for Evaluation, taking into account the specificities of each organization's requirements.

2. The governance structures of evaluation vary. In some cases it rests with the Governing Bodies in others with the Head of the organization. Responsibility for evaluation should be specified in an evaluation policy.

3. The Governing Bodies and/or the Heads of organizations are also responsible for ensuring that adequate resources are allocated to enable the evaluation function to operate effectively and with due independence.

4. The Governing Bodies and/or Heads of organizations and of the evaluation functions are responsible for ensuring that evaluations are conducted in an impartial and independent fashion. They are also responsible for ensuring that evaluators have the freedom to conduct their work without repercussions for career development.

N 6.1-6.5 (Independence)

1. The evaluation function has to be located independently from the other management functions so that it is free from undue influence and that unbiased and transparent reporting is ensured. It needs to have full discretion in submitting directly its reports for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making pertaining to evaluation.

2. The Head of evaluation must have the independence to supervise and report on evaluations as well as to track follow-up of management's response resulting from evaluation.

3. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators need to be independent, implying that members of an evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future.

4. Evaluators must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.

5. The independence of the evaluation function should not impinge the access that evaluators have to information on the subject of evaluation.

Credibility of Evaluations

N 1.2

1. An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance, etc. It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack thereof. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the interventions and contributions of the organizations of the UN system. An evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of the organizations of the UN system and its members.

N 1.4

1. There are other forms of assessment being conducted in the UN system. They vary in purpose and level of analysis, and may overlap to some extent. Evaluation is to be differentiated from appraisal, monitoring, review, inspection, investigation, audit, research, and internal management.

N 2.5

1. The Governing Bodies and/or Heads of organizations are responsible for appointing a professionally competent Head of evaluation, who in turn is responsible for ensuring, that the function is staffed by professionals competent in the conduct of evaluation.

N 3.1

1. Each organization should develop an explicit policy statement on evaluation. The policy should provide a clear explanation of the concept, role and use of evaluation within the organization, including the institutional framework and definition of roles and responsibilities; an explanation of how the evaluation function and evaluations are planned, managed and budgeted; and a clear statement on disclosure and dissemination.

N 5.1 – 5.3 (Impartiality)

1. Impartiality is the absence of bias in due process, methodological rigour, consideration and presentation of achievements and challenges. It also implies that the views of all stakeholders are taken into account. In the event that interested parties have different views, these are to be reflected in the evaluation analysis and reporting.
2. Impartiality increases the credibility of evaluation and reduces the bias in the data gathering, analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations. Impartiality provides legitimacy to evaluation and reduces the potential for conflict of interest.
3. The requirement for impartiality exists at all stages of the evaluation process, including the planning of evaluation, the formulation of mandate and scope, the selection of evaluation teams, the conduct of the evaluation and the formulation of findings and recommendations.

N 7.1 -7.2 (Evaluability)

1. During the planning stage of an undertaking, evaluation functions can contribute to the process by improving the ability to evaluate the undertaking and by building an evaluation approach into the plan. To safeguard independence this should be performed in an advisory capacity only.
2. Before undertaking a major evaluation requiring a significant investment of resources, it may be useful to conduct an evaluability exercise. This would consist of verifying if there is clarity in the intent of the subject to be evaluated, sufficient measurable indicators, assessable reliable information sources and no major factor hindering an impartial evaluation process.

N 8.1 (Quality of Evaluation)

1. Each evaluation should employ design, planning and implementation processes that are inherently quality oriented, covering appropriate methodologies for data-collection, analysis and interpretation.

N 8.2

1. Evaluation reports must present in a complete and balanced way the evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations. They must be brief, to the point and easy to understand. They must explain the methodology followed, highlight the methodological limitations of the evaluation, key concerns and evidence-based findings, dissident views and consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. They must have an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report, and facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

N 9.1 – 9.3 (Competencies for Evaluation)

1. Each organization of the UN system should have formal job descriptions and selection criteria that state the basic professional requirements necessary for an evaluator and evaluation manager.
2. The Head of the evaluation function must have proven competencies in the management of an evaluation function and in the conduct of evaluation studies.
3. Evaluators must have the basic skill set for conducting evaluation studies and managing externally hired evaluators.

N 11.1-11.5 (Evaluation Ethics)

1. Evaluators must have personal and professional integrity.
2. Evaluators must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to its source.
3. Evaluators must take care that those involved in evaluations have a chance to examine the statements attributed to them.
4. Evaluators must be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environments in which they work.
5. In light of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender inequality.
6. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Also, the evaluators are not expected to evaluate the personal performance of individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with due consideration for this principle.