



KINGDOM OF BELGIUM
Federal Public Service
**Foreign Affairs,
Foreign Trade and
Development Cooperation**

Peer Reviews of Evaluation Functions in the UN-System

IOB – UA 4 April 2014

Rationale

- Multilateral cooperation is ½ ODA for many donors : demand accountability
- Evaluating Effectiveness of Multilateral Organisations cause burden on bilateral evaluation offices and on MO



Options

- Trust the board
- Look at effectiveness from organisational perspective : MOPAN
- Add joint evaluations to MOPAN process
- Establish credibility of MO evaluations and make use of them



Approach

- Shift responsibility of evaluation on MO
- Organise soft quality control of MO-Evaluation function
- By professional peers
- Start: 2005 with UNDP
- 12 PR done so far (UN + IFAD + OSE)
- 5 more requested



Peer review ≠ Evaluation

- Focus on learning
- Similar
 - Data collection
 - Interviews
 - Analysis
 - Report
- Different
 - Peer exchange



Step by step

- Request to the UNEG-DAC Task-Force
- Peer Panel + Advisor
- TOR (in common)
- Normative framework
- Self-evaluation
- Review of background documentation (+ evaluation quality screening) and core issues
- Interviews
- (Field trip)
- Synthesis
- Peer exchange, feedback, report



Step by step

- Request to the UNEG-DAC Task-Force
- Peer Panel + Advisor
- TOR (in common)
- **Normative framework**
- Self-evaluation
- Documentary review (+ evaluation quality screening)
- Interviews
- (Field trip)
- Synthesis
- Peer exchange, feedback, report



Normative Framework for Peer Reviews

- Independence
- Credibility
- Utility
- Judgment against UNEG norms



Normative Framework for Peer Reviews

- **Independence**
 - **Structural**
 - Separate from line of command
 - Reporting line
 - **Institutional**
 - Evaluation policy
 - Programming, budget, planning
 - **Behavioural**
 - Avoid conflict of interest
- **Credibility**
- **Utility**



Normative Framework for Peer Reviews

- Independence
- **Credibility**
 - Methodological quality insurance
 - Adequate budget
 - Competent staff
 - Take final responsibility for evaluations
- **Utility**



Normative Framework for Peer Reviews

- Independence
- Credibility
- **Utility**
 - Use of evaluations for strategic decision making
 - Procedure for management response
 - Link evaluation and RBM
 - Harvesting lessons learnt, disseminating findings
 - Involve stakeholders from evaluation planning



Main lessons from Davies & Brümmer

- Leap of logic in associating peer reviews with
 - Improved organisational effectiveness
 - Better use of MO evaluations
- Key target of PR: senior management
- Peer exchange and learning \neq judgment
- Part of larger professionalisation process
- Donor process – few peers from South



Findings from specific PR : +

- Improved line of reporting
- Moving to strategic evaluations
- Advisory role on RBM
- Evaluation compliance statistics used in performance assessment of division directors



Findings from specific PR: -

- Budget autonomy a challenge
- Analyse geared toward output
- Feedback loop an issue



Website

Find peer reviews on UNEG website

UNEVAL>papers and publications>uneg-dac peer reviews

<http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/index.jsp;jsessionid=7B621884B43C9A69A6F1E4F0BA9B3079?ret=true#>

