**Internal Document**

# UNEG
## United Nations Evaluation Group

# United Nations Evaluation Group Evaluation Practice Exchange (EPE) 2012

# Report on Process and Lessons Learned

**Summary**

This report details the process and lessons learned by the EPE Organizing Committee (OC) 2012 in planning, organizing and facilitating the EPE 2012 session in Rome.  The report has two main sections, one addressing the overall process followed and the other on the lessons learned from the process and EPE event that could be helpful to future OCs in planning other EPEs.

# Introduction

1.  This report details the process and lessons learned by the EPE Organizing Committee (OC) 2012 in planning, organizing and facilitating the EPE 2012 session in Rome. The report has two main sections, one addressing the overall process followed and the other on the lessons learned from the process and EPE event that could be helpful to future OCs in planning other EPEs. Lastly, the report contains numerous annexes of material of documentation prepared by the OC and disseminated during the planning that may be helpful to future EPE OCs:

    - Annex 1, Survey on Topics and Formats for EPE 2012, page 11
    - Annex 2, Email requesting Expressions of Interest from UNEG Membership, sent by UNEG Secretariat on behalf of the EPE OC, page 16
    - Annex 3, EPE Agenda 2012, page 22
    - Annex 4, Guidance notes to Presenters, Small Group Work Facilitators, Poster Submitters, Session Chairs and Rapporteurs, page 25
    - Annex 5, Invitation to EPE, page 30
    - Annex 6, Small group work report form, page 31
    - Annex 7, UNEG_EPE_AGM Hosting guidance, page 32

# EPE 2012 – Process

2. **Membership:** The EPE Working Group was composed of staff of Evaluation Offices from various UN Agencies (OIOS, FAO, WFP, UN-OCHA, UNEP, UN-ESCAP, and UNDP). The inclusion of staff members from Agencies located in the place where EPE takes place is considered of utmost importance, to ensure smooth logistical planning. The EPE OC made sure that the UNEG Secretariat and participants from some of the co-hosting entities (FAO, WFP however not IFAD) were included in the EPE OC 2012.  In addition, membership included an office (OIOS) which co-chaired the EPE 2011, for lessons learned to be better integrated into the new programme.

3. **Communication:** For ease of communication, an EPE Working Group email address **- "**UNEG Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminar 2012" [uneg-tf-epe2012@list.unevaluation.org](mailto:uneg-tf-epe2012@list.unevaluation.org) - was created and maintained by the UNEG Secretariat.  The task force met 15 times via teleconference prior to the EPE event in April.

4. **Work programme & deliverables EPE 2012**
   The EPE OC had four deliverables for 2012:
   - Identify the topics and formats of the EPE 2012
   - Conduct the EPE 2012 over 2 days (23-24 April 2012) at FAO HQ, Rome
   - Develop an EPE Principles document
   - Produce an EPE Summary Report and Lessons Learned document

## Preparatory steps for EPE 2012

5. The EPE OC for 2012 focused on organizing an EPE that was dynamic and interactive utilizing differing formats on varied topics towards which UNEG membership showed the most interest, on the basis of feedback from the 2011 UNEG EPE and AGM, as well as a survey sent to UNEG membership.

### Defining the themes (July – August 2011)

6. As in prior years, the team decided to define the themes in an inclusive, participatory manner through a survey to all UNEG members. **(See Annex 1).** The survey asked members:
   - to rank suggested topics (based on UNEG Task Force themes and feedback from the UNEG AGM and EPE in 2011);
   - to suggest additional/new topics;
   - to volunteer topic(s) for presentation; and
   - to flag interest in chairing a session.

7. The survey was administered in July and August to all UNEG membership, and got a 26% answer rate. Survey monkey was used to collect responses. Based on the responses, the EPE OC identified the following three themes for the EPE 2012:
   * Managing Evaluations
   * RBM and Evaluations
   * Evaluation of Complexity

8. The survey data also noted a preference for differing formats from previous years to allow opportunities for smaller discussions and work. The EPE OC discussed various options in this regard, selecting small group work with a facilitator and poster sessions during coffee breaks as the most feasible options to integrate into the agenda for EPE 2012. Traditional plenary presentations were also retained as a format with these sessions providing an overall subject matter umbrella of the smaller group sessions.

## *Requesting Expressions of Interest (December 2011)*

9. After consulting with the UNEG Coordination Committee, the EPE OC sent out to all UNEG members a request for Expressions of Interest in presenting at the EPE 2012, which had to indicate under which of the three topic themes the presentation would have fit, as well as the favorite format for presentation (plenary presentation, small group work, and poster submission) (**see Annex 2**). The EPE OC also asked each UNEG head to distribute an invitation to participate via web-streaming to their relevant evaluation focal points in decentralized functions, including in offices away from headquarters.

10. The EPE OC reviewed and accepted all the 19 submissions, grouped them according to the topic areas and assessed what format was most appropriate based on the description provided and the objective of having a balanced EPE Agenda in terms of topics and formats over two days.

## *Preparing the agenda  (January – February 2012)*

11. An agenda for the EPE was drafted with Day 1 being split between the topics of "Managing Evaluations" and "RBM and Evaluation" and involved all three different formats. The agenda for Day 2 was primarily on the Evaluation of Complexity with time scheduled for the discussion of the draft EPE Principles and items to present to the AGM. (**see Annex 3**)

12. Additionally, the EPE OC requested and received agreement from the UNEG Bureau and Heads that an external expert be invited to facilitate and present on a topic of interest (evaluation of complexity) for which it was deemed that an expert overview would add value beyond the experiences of the UNEG members.

## Guidance notes   (February 2012)

13. At the same time, emails were sent to all presenters noting their inclusion in the EPE Agenda 2012 and seeking clarification as necessary.  For example, further information was sought on what was to be presented and how it linked to the theme, or a different format from the one indicated by the presenter was suggested. The presenters were informed the EPE OC members who would be chairing the theme topic and working with them on the material in preparation for EPE 2012. Draft presentations were reviewed by OC chairs and feedback provided on each presentation with a particular effort made to avoid duplication between presentations and to focus on innovations.

14. The team followed the practice established in prior years and shared a "Guidance note for presenters, small group facilitators, poster submitters, session chairs and rapporteurs". **(See Annex 4).** Those contained clear messages on number of slides and duration as well as submission timelines.

## Webstreaming testing (March 2012)

15. FAO administered one test of the webstreaming software March 13, 2012.  This allowed for testing of the weblink, audio, picture quality and feedback to the email address set up for the EPE 2012 for remote participants. Online registration for the EPE allowed for registration for web access – however, in practice, only one person registered for online participation. In total, 20 people eventually participated via webcast. Considering cost and time of setting up the webstreaming, the 2012 OC is uncertain as to whether the effort of setting up the webcast is cost efficiency.

## Logistics  (December  2011 – April  2012):

16. The team agreed to organize the EPE over 2 days prior to the AGM as is customary, see Annex 7 for the UNEG EPE AGM Hosting Guidance.  Logistically organization included:

17. **UNEG website**:  The EPE OC worked with the UNEG Secretariat to enhance the UNEG website to allow online registration, posting of documents that could be commented on and other information disbursed. Registration opened 6 weeks prior to the EPE and by the event date 89 participants had registered.  All presentations were loaded on the website the week before the EPE.

18. **Logistics package**: A package with information on airport, transportation, hotels, etc was prepared by the co-hosts and posted on the UNEG website.

19. **Rooms**: FAO booked several sized rooms for the session with a large plenary room with space for poster sessions outside of it and several other rooms for small group work sessions. As it was not known a priori which sessions people would choose to attend, it was challenging to decide on the

capacity needed for each break out space. In the end, breakout areas (4) should have capacity for a minimum of 40 participants each.

20. **Catering**: For the first time in 2012, coffee breaks were organized (outside the meeting room) and paid for by the hosting agencies. This allowed for better exchanges amongst participants and faster transitions back to the meeting room and should be encouraged for future EPEs.

21. **Security**: Participant information was required 12 days in advance to enable FAO security to process and create badges.

22. **Webstreaming**: Webstreaming of the plenary sessions was organizing and an email account set up for webstreaming participants to email questions or comments (uneg-2012@fao.org). The cost for webstreaming was 200 Euros per day. The recorded sessions are accessible at:

    **23 April Sessions**

    http://193.43.36.192/20120423-UNEG-Evaluation-Practice-Exchange-2012-morning

    http://193.43.36.192/20120423-UNEG-Evaluation-Practice-Exchange-2012-afternoon

    **April 24 Sessions**

    http://193.43.36.192/20120424-UNEG-Evaluation-Practice-Exchange-2012-morning

    http://193.43.36.192/20120424-UNEG-Evaluation-Practice-Exchange-2012-afternoon

23. **Social Events**: Two social events were organized, a cocktail reception courtesy of the co-hosts and a self-pay dinner at a local restaurant. The EPE OC administered a web-based survey to gather RSVP information and meal choices with monies collected prior to the event. Both of these innovations appeared appreciated by participants – the cost of the cocktail and coffee breaks was $3,000 USD (divided between the 3 hosting agencies).

## Conducting the EPE 2012 (April 2012)

24. The EPE session was opened by the UNEG Chair (Belen Sanz), the Director of Evaluation at FAO (Bob Moore) with the EPE co-chairs providing talking points for each on such items as: when the event was last hosted in Rome, number of participants and agencies in attendance, the purpose of the EPE etc. The co-chairs also gave a brief introduction to the EPE – including logistics, topics, formats and agenda before handing over to the session chairs.

25. Two of the three thematic sessions opened with a panel. For the RBM session, no UNEG members offered to make a panel presentation and so the format for this session involved only group work. Feedback from participants suggested that this was not ideal as people had to leap in "cold" to discussions without any real warm up to the topic.

26. After each thematic session, the Co-Chairs open the concluding discussions for feedback and lessons learned. Not all sessions stayed within the allocated timeframe; some discussions had to be cut short in order to allow for the next session to start. Main points can be found in the EPE Summary document as well as in the Lessons Learned note at the end of this document.

27. **Reporting:** The EPE OC hired a consultant to be a rapporteur for the plenary sessions and draft a summary of all sessions. The small group work had a reporting form to fill out that covered items such as participants, key issues discussed, and items to take forward to the AGM. (see Annex 6). Session rapporteurs were asked to validate their summary notes by the session chair and share them with an EPE team member one week after the event.

28. One co-host member (from IFAD) was in charge of monitoring the email the webinars throughout the sessions. This included sharing questions from remoter participants with the session chair during the discussion.

## Post-EPE steps (May 2012)

29. **Webstreaming**: All recorded webstreaming were posted on the UNEG intranet.

30. **Evaluation/ feedback:** The EPE OC asked in person participants for immediate feedback near the end of the EPE session so that the EPE OC would have some immediate information to present to the AGM. The immediate feedback was presented to three questions on flip charts with a scale of satisfaction and participants given dot stickers to indicate their level of satisfaction on the scale. All ratings were in the "satisfied" and "very satisfied" range. An additional flip chart was provided to note any open-ended comments, feedback or suggestions.

31. Unfortunately, online participants did not register so the EPE OC was unable to seek feedback from all the participants. However, some participants did email the webstreaming address providing to participants with feedback.

32. **Reports:** The EPE OC drafted two reports: EPE session report and process/lessons learned reports. The EPE session report focused on the content of the sessions and any major issues raised while the process/lessons learned report focused on

# EPE 2012 – Lessons Learned

## Topic and Format Survey:

33. **Drafting:** Prior to drafting a topic and format survey, for the upcoming EPE, be sure to review the EPE and AGM session reports for any notations of topics or formats of interest. Additionally, contact the UNEG Secretariat about any topics or issues that may have arisen throughout the year.

34. **Administering:** Ensure at least four weeks for response to any EPE-related survey to ensure adequate response. Survey and reminders should be circulated by UNEG Secretariat for maximum response.

## Session format:

35. At the end of EPE, participants provided feedback that they appreciated the mixture of plenary sessions, presentations, and small group work.

36. **Plenary sessions:** The 2011 EPE identified topics via a survey to all UNEG members, which were similar to prior EPE topics. Following the AGM 2011 deliberations, the 2012 team decided to organize the seminar around several overarching themes, with each session addressing a sub-theme. Identifying specific learning objectives for each session (see EPE 2010 and 2011 agendas) might still be useful for the next EPE.

37. **Small group work:** This format worked best when a plenary session on the topic preceded the small group work. Participants provided feedback that they appreciated the opportunity to share experience in the small group sessions.

38. **Format selection:** Discuss amongst the OC and with the presenter which format is best to stimulate discussion on each topic and explore other formats, such as panels. Consider whether inviting an external expert would be useful for learning on the subject.

39. **Webstreaming:** Discuss whether to make use of webstreaming as well as the UNEG website in between the EPE seminars. Ensure that it is clear whether it will be possible or not to follow the small group work on the webstreaming.

## Expressions of interest for presentations:

40. Allow for **ample time** to receive abstracts/ draft presentations.

41. Consider emailing UNEG Heads to request submissions from their evaluation offices. Additionally, consider posting on the UNEG-forum request for expressions of interest. These could both result in more submissions and a more competitive screening process for the selection of presentations could help to increase the quality of presentations. Submission of initial abstracts should be requested and

8

reviewed by the EPE Team, with an understanding that not all proposed presentations may be included in the final agenda. Rather have **few good presentations than accommodating everybody.**

42. **Number of presentations:** Selection of total number of presentations for inclusion in the agenda should be based on the time available for the EPE and within each session. Presentation times should be limited to 10-12 minutes in order to allow ample time for discussion and interaction. Parallel sessions can also be explored – especially if all will be recorded as webinars and later accessible online.

43. **Quality Assurance:** Review of draft presentations for quality assurance is time consuming. Early identification and involvement of Session Chairs may also improve the scope and quality of the sessions. Assigning session chairs early on to provide guidance /be the key focal point for the session was useful. Developing clear guidelines/criteria to guide the review of presentations, for example with regard to topic/learning objectives, style and length could be useful. Be firm about considering how long the presentations will take in providing feedback.

44. **Papers:** Discuss whether presenters should/could also submit a paper along with their presentation, which could be useful in informing participants upfront.

## Communication:

45. Regular communication with Presenters, Chairs and Rapporteurs early on clarifying expectations and deadlines is very helpful for coordinating the EPE.

46. Regular communication and liaison with the UNEG Secretariat is key to ensure a smooth event; participation of the UNEG Secretariat as well as the hosting entity was extremely helpful.

47. UNEG Coordination Committee meetings are a very useful forum for communicating issues, making requests and obtaining decisions on EPE questions.

## Conducting the EPE

48. Allow for ample discussion time and try to focus less on clarification questions and more on those questions triggering substantive discussion. Use two full days, but do not necessarily plan the second half of day two in order to allow for discussion and exchange.

49. The co-hosts provided coffee break refreshments outside the plenary room. This assisted in keeping to the schedule, streamlined the coffee break process and facilitated networking. The social events were well attended but required some effort to organize. The cocktail party prior to the dinner worked well logistically with dinner attendees walking to the restaurant together after it. The next EPE OC should consider whether the restaurants near the location of the EPE require booking and pre-payment of the meal.

50. Discuss modalities for gathering feedback on the EPE. Immediate feedback was sought at the EPE to enable the co-chairs to provide feedback to the AGM. Additionally, the EPE OC discussed sending a more detailed survey to participants to obtain more specific information on topics, formats and logistics.

51. There is an expectation that the EPE will give rise to "issues" to take forward to the AGM. In practice, the EPE is really a learning and sharing opportunity that does not naturally result in the identification of common or priority issues. Some additional thought needs to go into the key inputs required from the EPE for the AGM and how to solicit them.

## Webstreaming:

52. The 2011 team introduced them for the first time to the EPE, general feedback was positive, and EPE OC 2012 carried this practice forward. Ideally, webstreaming participants should have registered online to allow for systematic follow-up with them post-EPE. Unfortunately, not all online participants registered. There were 20 participants of webstreaming per session, but it was not possible or practical to webstream the small group work.

53. **Team member presence at the EPE:**
Organizing Committee members should be supported by their entity to attend the EPE. Their presence considerably helps the UNEG Secretariat and co-chairs to ensure a smooth event.

10

# ANNEX 1– EPE 2012 Topic survey

Dear UNEG Colleagues,

*The objective of the Evaluation Practices Exchange (EPE) is to facilitate regular learning amongst UN evaluators (including those carrying out or managing evaluations according to the practices in different UN organizations) in order to improve the quality and utilization of UN evaluations. EPE is a platform for sharing information and experiences related primarily to evaluation approaches and methodologies through peer learning and support with expert knowledge included as appropriate. EPE contributes to the establishment of a community of practice amongst UN evaluation practitioners for peer support and learning on a continuous basis between EPE annual events as necessary.*[1]

The next UNEG Evaluation Practice Exchange (EPE) will take place from 23-24 April 2012 before the UNEG Annual General Meeting. The event will be co-hosted by FAO, WFP and IFAD and held at the FAO offices in Rome.

As in prior years, the organizing committee of the **EPE** invites you to take a survey on the focus of the EPE for 2012. **Your input is critically important to help** the organizing committee design an EPE that meets your needs and interests.

 Please take a few minutes to respond to the survey by clicking on this link:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MMRSHST

 **Please respond to the survey by August 22, 2011.**

If you have any questions about the EPE or this survey, kindly contact the EPE 2012 Co-Chairs:

Lori Bell, FAO             (Lori.Bell@fao.org)
Emily Hampton-Manley, OIOS       (hampton-manley@un.org)

**Thank you for your participation!**

---

[1] Please note this is a draft definition that the EPE Task Force is developing for discussion with the EPE participants and endorsement at the Annual General Meeting 2012.

# Survey: UNEG EPE 2012

1. **Please indicate on the below sliding scale, how the EPE can best add value:**

   **(10 being the highest value; 1 being the lowest value)**

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Exchange of practice: learning from experiences of other UN colleagues | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning from experts outside the UN | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Networking with other UN evaluation colleagues | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Getting feedback from colleagues on your work | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

2. **Please note any other ways the EPE could add value not captured above.**

   *[unlimited text field ]*

3. **The EPE Task Force is considering organizing the EPE around one or two themes, and to focus a series of presentations and discussions around it.  For example, if "managing complex evaluations" was chosen as the theme, topics might include: scoping, recruiting teams, defining methodologies, etc.**

   **Would a thematic EPE be of interest to you?**

   ☐ One single theme
   ☐ Two themes (one theme each day)
   ☐ No (3-8 specific topics in which participants showed interest)

4. **Please indicate your interest in the following topics, which were suggested by participants during the EPE 2011:**

| | Preference | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Suggested Topics** | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5th |
| Managing evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Evaluation of complexity:  when a logframe or linear model does not apply or is not the best evaluation framework. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Results Based Management and Evaluation: linkage between planning, monitoring and evaluation | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| | Preference | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Suggested Topics** | **1**st | **2**nd | **3**rd | **4**th | **5**th |
| A UNEG Taskforce Theme:<br>• Evaluation of Human Rights and Gender Equality | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| • Joint Evaluation | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| • National Evaluation Capacity | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| • Evaluation of Normative Work | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

5. **Please name any other topic(s) you would like to see on the agenda of the UNEG Evaluation Practice Exchange 2012.** Note: Impact Evaluation is not proposed as a potential theme as the NONIE meeting will be held immediately before the EPE and will provide a forum for experience sharing in Impact Evaluation

    *[unlimited text field ]*

6. **Please indicate your preferences for the format of the EPE 2012:**

| | Preference | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Format** | **1**st | **2**nd | **3**rd | **4**th | **5th** |
| Expert presentations, followed by Q&A session | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Peer Presentations and break out groups to exchange experiences | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Case studies presented followed by peer advice | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Interactive ways to learn from others' experiences (i.e. peer assists, fishbowls, poster sessions or similar activities) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other type of format<br>    *[unlimited text field ]* | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

7. **Would you be interested in presenting a topic at the UNEG Evaluation Practice Exchange 2012?**

    ☐ Yes / Possibly → Please indicate the topic (be specific) and your contact details:
                        *[unlimited text field ]*
    ☐ No

8. **Would you be interested in chairing a session?**

   ☐ Yes / Possibly → Please provide your contact details
   
   *[unlimited text field ]*

   ☐ No

9. **Would you be interested in facilitating a "break-out" group?  A "break-out" group may involve smaller group discussions and practical exercises on topics presented in EPE sessions.**

   ☐ Yes / Possibly: → Please provide your contact details
   
   *[unlimited text field ]*

   ☐ No

**Questions about yourself:**

10. *In which United Nations entity are you currently working?*
   *[scroll down menu with all UNEG member entities plus a category 'other']*

11. *How many years have you been working in the field of evaluation?*
   *[unlimited text field ]*

12. *Please indicate the roles you play within evaluation:*

| | Very important | Important | Slightly important | Low importance | Not undertaking this work |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Managing evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Conducting evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Evaluation capacity development in the organization | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Evaluation policy/standard setting in the organization | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Evaluation capacity development at the national level | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Sharing information/knowledge about evaluation | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Planning and monitoring activities | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other: *[unlimited text field]* | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

13. **If you are managing and or conducting evaluations, please indicate the importance of different types of evaluations in your work:**

| | Very important | Important | Slightly important | Low importance | Not undertaking this work |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Impact evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Project evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Country portfolio evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Policy evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Strategic/Thematic evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Normative evaluation | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Developmental evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Emergency evaluations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other: *[unlimited text field]* | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

14. **Are you planning to participate in person at the UNEG EPE 2012 co-hosted by WFP, IFAD and FAO in Rome in April 2012?**

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know yet

15. **Are you planning to participate via webinar of the UNEG EPE in 2012?**

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know yet

16. **Finally, please use this space to communicate any other issue to help the task force plan the EPE.**

**Thank you for your participation!**

# ANNEX 2 – Email requesting Expressions of Interest from UNEG Membership, sent by UNEG Secretariat on behalf of the EPE OC

Dear UNEG Colleagues,

On behalf of the 2012 EPE Organizing Committee, we would like to thank all agencies and colleagues for timely response to the 2012 EPE Topic Survey. Based on the priorities expressed by UNEG members through the survey, the Organizing Committee plans to organize the EPE sessions around the following themes:

- Managing Evaluations
- Evaluation and Results Based Management
- Evaluation of Complexity

For further information on the themes and suggested topics please see the attached Annex.

 This year we would like to try to make the event very participative and we are proposing a format for the different sessions that will have you all moving around and talking!  Instead of "expert presenters" we would like to identify individuals who would be willing to prepare and lead discussions through interactive plenary and group discussion sessions using peer presentations, roundtable discussions, poster sessions and perhaps even a "talk show" format for our expert session on evaluation of complexity.  We will once again be making the EPE available on Webinar and hope to compliment this with other online sharing tools such as an EPE Wiki. We are also planning some social events to encourage networking.

Now that the topics have been identified, we would like to call for a second round of proposals inviting expressions of interested for the three topics identified above.  You are also asked what format you would prefer to provide support in.  Please see the annex for definitions of the types of formats.

 If you are interested in being a thematic leader at the 2012 EPE, kindly provide a brief outline in the format attached on the specific expertise that you have in the thematic area and specific topic(s) suggested and what specific experience  you would like to share and how it will contribute to learning.

UNEG members who already expressed interest during the survey are invited to further develop their proposals. The Organizing Committee encourages joint submissions.

Please send your proposal **by December 10th**, to the UNEG Secretariat at tina.tordjman-nebe@undp.org with copy to Sabrina Evangelista evangelistas@un.org

 With best wishes,
Lori Bell, FAO
Emily Hampton-Manly, OIOS
 2012 EPE Co-Chairs

# Expression of Interest

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | |
| Title | |
| Organization | |
| Email | |
| Telephone | |
| Specific Topic title: | |
| Theme the topic relates to<br>Choose one:<br><br>Managing evaluations      Evaluation and Results Based Management      Evaluation of Complexity | |
| Please indicate your first choice and your second choice of formats:<br>    \_\_\_\_\_ Panel presentation<br>    \_\_\_\_\_ Poster session presentation<br>    \_\_\_\_\_ Small group learning session<br><br>If you are proposing a small group learning event, please describe how you would propose to organize it and if you would like a facilitator to work with you. | |
| Brief Abstract (what you would present, why it's important, how is it innovative, how you would approach the topic, lesson learned) | |
| Is this a joint presentation?  If so please provide the name and organizational of your co-presenter(s) | |
| Do you have any written material (articles, guidelines, reports, etc.) that will be distributed on your topic?  If so, please specify. | |

# ANNEX

**The following Annex provides information on selection criteria, definitions of the formats and session themes with suggested topics.**

**Selection criteria include:** clearly relevant to one of the themes of the workshop; strong potential for learning; practical approach linked to real world experience; likely to be relevant to a wide range of EPE participants (not so specific as to be relevant to just a few)

Overall, the organizers will be looking for a range of diverse and learning oriented formats and for a balance between the three themes.

**Definitions of formats:**
- **Panel presentations:** Short PowerPoint presentations will be made from 3-5 speakers followed by question and answer session and discussion
- **Poster presentations:** Visual presentations and displays of UNEG member's work will be presented in an open reception area, which will enable informal discussion of practical tools and experiences. These could include presentation of tools, publications, or evaluation results in a visual way. Flip chart stands, flip chart paper, pens, glue etc will be provided and the poster session will include refreshments to encourage an informal atmosphere.
- **Small group learning sessions:** small group facilitated sessions to discuss and learn from each other's practical experiences related to the themes of the EPE. Facilitators will be available upon request, but EPE members are expected to propose the content and approach, and creativity is welcome as are joint proposals and shared responsibility for convening and organizing a session. Break out space, flip charts, and associated materials will be available.

**Definitions of Session Themes and Suggested Topics**

---

**THEME: Managing Evaluations**

---

**DEFINITION:** Planning, organizing and implementing the evaluation process, including: topic selection, evaluation process management, methods, report, lessons learned

**Potential topics:**
**Topic selection**
  Approaches to selecting evaluation projects, including:
- Risk based
- Request
- Mandate
- Emergency based
- Pros and cons of selection methods and lessons learned from approaches.

- **Evaluation management**
  Planning, organizing, monitoring and managing the evaluation process
    - Role and responsibilities of the evaluation manager, staff and/or consultants
    - Resources (staff, consultants and money)

18

- Use of Advisory Panels or Experts
- Field based missions

- **Evaluation Methods**

Selecting, utilizing and adapting appropriate methods for collecting and analyzing data.
  - Adapting methods to the purpose, timeframe and resources available
  - Ensuring quality evaluations

- **Evaluation Reports**

Utilizing and communicating the outputs of an evaluation.
  - Types of outputs from the evaluation, e.g. reports, presentations, journal articles
  - Writing well pitched outputs
  - Communicating results to varying audiences **(**funders, governmental bodies etc)

- **_Lessons Learned and good practices from evaluations_**

Reviewing evaluations and assessing the good, the bad and the ugly.
  - Mechanisms for ensuring lessons learned are incorporated into future evaluations
  - Identifying and sharing good practices

---

**THEME: Role of Evaluation in Results Based Management (RBM)**

---

**DEFINITION of RBM:** a management strategy aimed at achieving improved performance and results by defining expected results, monitoring progress towards their achievement and integrating lessons learned into management decisions and reporting on performance.[2,3]

UNEG members have differing views on the role of evaluation in results based management, which is mainly attributable to the diverse organizational structures, funding arrangements, and types of evaluation functions.[4]  Thus, this EPE theme seeks to explore the diverse range of issues faced by UNEG members in terms of the role of evaluation in results based management.

- Building strong monitoring evidence (establishing and maintaining an M&E system including key concepts, elements and challenges)
- Linkage between headquarters and decentralized evaluations (guidance, training, quality assurance, monitoring of the implementation of recommendations, etc.)

---

[2] UNEG, "The Role of Evaluation in Results Based Management," 2007; p. 2

[3] Based on OIOS and UNDP definitions

[4] In 2007 UNEG completed a survey amongst UN evaluation units that found that there were mixed views on the role of evaluation in results based management. Half of the respondents believe that evaluation is an explicit element of the RBM conceptual framework, and the other half consider evaluation as a complementary function. About one third of respondents believed that evaluation is an independent function and should not be considered part of RBM systems due to conflict of interest. (UNEG, Role of Evaluation in RBM, p.7)

- Ensuring that evaluative evidence feeds into decision making on programme planning, policy setting, etc. (i.e. tailoring evaluation outputs and communicating results to target audiences, utilization based approaches, etc.)

---

**THEME: Evaluation of Complexity**

---

**DEFINITION:** Complexity has been given much attention in recent years because of its potential to provide an approach to evaluating the non-linear and dynamic landscape of development and humanitarian issues. While complexity or chaos theory has its foundation in mathematics, its focus on dynamic systems has been seen as relevant for evaluation because as described by Michael Q. Patton, "it challenges us to deal with unpredictability and indeterminism in human behaviour and therefore in the interventions (programs) we devise to alter human behaviour as well a the unpredictability of the methods we use to study and evaluate those interventions."[5] To effectively evaluate complex areas of work, evaluators are challenged to look beyond linear, hierarchical approaches to evaluation, such as logic modelling, to analyze systems and the interconnections within to look at change processes and social-economic contexts as non-linear and adaptive.[6]

This EPE theme seeks to explore how complexity relates to the areas of work being evaluated by UN evaluators and how new approaches and methods can be applied to evaluating complex areas of work within the UN context, with a focus on moving beyond theory to examples of its use.

**Potential topics:**

**Implications of complexity of social change for the evaluation design**

*People are invited to showcase examples (general evaluation designs, methodologies or other components) that reflect on the following categories of complexity-related topics:*

| Evaluation component | Subtopics | Practical field of application (suggestions) |
|---|---|---|
| **Methodologies and Approaches to evaluation** | • Developing new theories of change and/or adapting existing theories of change to challenge assumptions of linearity; | Show cases of multiple simultaneous causal strands accounted for in evaluations |
| | • How to conceptualize, capture and measure different types of change: incremental, cumulative, with tipping | Evaluations of Peace and Security programmes |

---

[5] Patton, Michael Q. Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods, Sage Publications Inc.: California, 2002; p.123

[6] Ramalingam, Ben, Panos lecture series, "How can complexity theory contribute to more effective development and aid evaluation?" Panos London, October 2009.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | points; | |
| | • Introducing human rights and gender equality as a basis for the interconnected nature of change by studying patterns of incentives and interactions among agents. | Negotiating multiple perspectives and the transformational nature of change |
| | | |
| **Focus of evaluations** | • Elements in the evaluation design that allow for interdependence and interconnections in the system the program is trying to influence and capture the resulting dynamics and changes in the programme itself; | Governmental learning |
| | • How and to what extent it is possible to include in the evaluation focus the interactions between the organization and its environment; | One UN evaluations and the interactions of development aid and national counterparts |
| | • Understanding time within the production of change: analyzing changing dynamics in the programme implementation over time; acknowledging changes in conditions that impact programme implementation and results. | Transition from humanitarian action to development |
| | | |
| **Purpose and scope of evaluations** | • Methodologies and approaches to assess changes in direction and evolution of goals and yet focus on accountability; | New criteria to measure capacity for diagnosis, solution design and decision making |
| | • How the evaluation of complexity can help supporting learning by challenging one-dimensional concepts of success, fixed goals and fear of failure. | Allowing pilots to fail |

**UNEG**
United Nations Evaluation Group

# Agenda

# Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminar 2012

**Dates: 23 – 24 April 2012**

**Location: Iran Room, FAO HQ**

**Host agencies: FAO**

| Time | Monday 23rd April |
|---|---|
| 8:30-9:00 | Arrival of participants at FAO and clearing through security. Registration of Participants. |
| 9:00-9:30 | Opening Welcome – Belen Sanz, Chair of UNEG & Robert Moore, FAO, on behalf of host agencies<br>Presentation of EPE Theme Chairs and the EPE Programme, Lori Bell + Emily Hampton-Manley |
| **Theme 1** | **Managing Evaluations – Chair: Jock Paul** |
| 9:30-9:45 | Introduction to the topic – Jock Paul |
| 9:45-10:45 | Panel Presentations : types of evaluations<br>• Jamie Watts, WFP: Global/Thematic Evaluations<br>• Krishna Belbase, UNICEF: Multi-Country Evaluations<br>• Adan Ruiz, Millennium Development Achievement Fund : Joint Programme Evaluations<br>• Juha Uitto, UNDP: Country Evaluations |
| 10:45- 11:15 | Coffee Break and Managing Evaluation Resource Share Fair |
| 11:15-12:15 | Small Group Work on same topics moderated by panel presenters (Jamie Watts, Krishna Belbase, Adan Ruiz, Juha Uitto) |
| 12:15-13:15 | Lunch |
| 13:15-14:15 | Small Group Work (4) on Managing Evaluations on sub topics related to specific evaluation steps<br>• Miguel Torralba, IFAD: good practice recommendations<br>• Seetharam Mukkavilli, IAEA: panel evaluation method<br>• Maria Santamaria, WHO: the evaluation work plan<br>• Anna Guerraggio, UNEP: consultant management |
| **Theme 2** | **RBM & Evaluation – Chair: Anna Guerraggio** |
| 14:15-14:30 | Introduction to the topic - Anna Guerraggio |
| 14:30-15:30 | Panel Presentation with Q&A: Feeding evaluation evidence on gender equity into decision-making and culture change, Facilitator, Belen Sanz, UN Women<br>• Inga Sniukaite, UN Women, RBM and evaluation in UN-Women<br>• Tuilia Aiazzi, FAO, and Ashwani Muthoo, IFAD, Opportunities and Challenges of evaluating gender equality in corporate culture |
| 15:30-16:00 | Coffee break with poster session<br>• Louis Charpentier, UNFPA – Evaluation Quality Assessment<br>• Cinza Cruciani, Frederica Zelada, Jan Michiels, WFP – WFP's Evaluation Quality Assessment system |
| 16:00-17:00 | Small Group Work<br>• Marco Segone, UNICEF and Oscar Garcia, UNDP – Decentralized evaluation function<br>• Belen Sanz, Inga Sniukaite, UN Women, Tulia Aiazzi, FAO, and Ashwani Muthoo, IFAD, Evaluating gender equality in corporate culture |
| 17:00-17:15 | Comments about the day overall and close for the day – Lori Bell & Emily Hampton-Manley |
| 18:00 - onwards | Cocktail party on the FAO rooftop terrace co-hosted by FAO, WFP and IFAD. Open invitation to dinner at La Villetta, 7.30pm (self-pay) |

| Time | Tuesday 24th April |
|------|--------------------|
| 8:30 | Arrival of participants at FAO and clearing through security |
| 9:00- 9:30 | Recap of day 1 and any announcements, Lori Bell & Emily Hampton-Manley |
| **Theme 3** | **Evaluation of Complexity – Chair: Jamie Watts** |
| 9:30-10:30 | Evaluation of Complexity:  Ben Ramalingam<br>• Introduction of key concepts of complexity<br>• Evaluation of complexity<br>• Q&A and discussion |
| 10:30-11:00 | Coffee Break (30 min) |
| 11:00- 12:00 | Panel presentations, introduced by Jamie Watts<br>• Marian Read, WFP: Joint Evaluation of Refugees in Protracted Situations: How WFP and UNHCR handle complexity<br>• Neeraj Negi, GEF: Incorporating Complex Systems Analysis into Theory of Change Impact Evaluation<br>• Peter Loewe, UNIDO: Modelling Systems Dynamics: How useful is it for evaluating "Industrial Upgrading" projects<br>• Indran Naidoo, UNDP: Evaluation of Complex UNDP Programmes and Themes in Complicated Contexts |
| 12:00-12:30 | Panel Q&A facilitated by Ben Ramalingam |
| 12:30-13:30 | Lunch |
| 13:30-14:30 | Discuss draft EPE definition and principles |
| 14:30-15:30 | Discussions of main issues emerging from EPE : key messages for AGM presentations by Session Chairs followed by discussion |
| 15:30-16:00 | Coffee Break (30 min) |
| 16:00-16:30 | Wrap up and feedback activity/Lessons learned for 2013. |
| 16:30 | Closure |

24

# ANNEX 4– Guidance notes to Presenters, Small Group Work Facilitators, Poster Submitters, Session Chairs and Rapporteurs

## Guidance for EPE Panel Presenters

The UNEG EPE Organizing Committee appreciates your interest in participating as a panel presenter in the EPE 2012 in Rome, hosted by FAO, WFP and IFAD from 23-24 April. We would like to provide you with some basic further guidance and timelines for the development of your presentation to ensure coordination and organization of each session.

The EPE sessions will focus on three themes identified by UNEG members as topics they are most interested to learn about and discuss. These are:

- Managing Evaluations
- Evaluation and Results Based Management
- Evaluation of Complexity

Panel Presentations will include 3-5 presentations. The presentations should aim at:

☐ Clearly relating the theme of your presentation to your session topic;

☐ Sharing lessons, challenges, and experiences that will be of interest to UNEG members and which highlight areas of innovation; and

☐ Focusing on methodological rather than substantive issues[7].

Each presenter will be allotted max. 10-15 minutes for their presentation. Presentations will be followed by either a Q&A or small group work exercise which will be used to solicit experiences from other colleagues on the same topic.

The EPE Organizing Committee will review all draft presentations and provide feedback to avoid duplication and to ensure coherence among presentations. Two task force members have been identified for each theme to work with the group of presenters/facilitators on the combination of discussions to ensure maximum synergy and they will be contacting you in the coming weeks to support you as you refine the scope and content of your presentation.

---

[7] Presenters should avoid presenting results of evaluations. A presentation which is drawn from experience in undertaking an evaluation of agency performance over 5 years in a highly volatile environment should focus on the methodological and conceptual choices made rather than the work done by the agency or the conclusions of the evaluation with respect to the agencies work.

Each session will have a chair (TBD) who is responsible for:

- ☐ Introducing the topic and the presenter(s);
- ☐ Ensuring that presenters keep to the allotted time;
- ☐ Facilitating the plenary discussion (30-45 min per session); and
- ☐ Wrapping up the session.

To allow for a large participation of the EPE to the UNEG community, the EPE 2012 will again be broadcasting the presentations live via webstreaming. Webstreaming would be accessible to United Nations staff worldwide, and some recorded presentations would later be made available on the UNEG website.

Also, presenters are encouraged to contact the session chair and presenters of the same session in order to ensure coordination.

Timeline for submitting your draft and final presentation (either a 2 page presentation outline or powerpoint presentation of no more than 10 slides (using no less than 24pt font).

**Timeline for Development of Presentations**

| | |
|---|---|
| Submission of draft presentation to EPE Organizing Committee | **21 March** |
| EPE Organizing Committee to review and share feedback | **2 April** |
| Submission of final presentations | **16 April** |

Please send your presentations to: lori.bell@fao.org with copy to [Hampton-manley@un.org](Hampton-manley@un.org).


## Guidance for EPE Small Group Work Facilitators

The UNEG EPE Organizing Committee appreciates your interest in participating as a small group work facilitator in the EPE 2012 in Rome, hosted by FAO, WFP and IFAD from 23-24 April. We would like to provide you with some basic further guidance and timelines for the development of your session outline to ensure coordination and organization of each session.

The EPE sessions will focus on three themes identified by UNEG members as topics they are most interested to learn about and discuss. These are:

- Managing Evaluations
- Evaluation and Results Based Management
- Evaluation of Complexity

Small group work sessions will include 10-15 participants each and will last one hour.  The objective of the small group work is to identify any innovative or interesting examples of how the UN evaluation managers have addressed the topic.

26

Facilitators will open the session by sharing with the group their own experience in the topic. Facilitators will then open the floor for sharing and discussion by all participants.  We would suggest that the facilitator have 4-5 prompt questions to get the conversation going if needed. A one page summary format will be provided to record and allow for sharing of these ideas outside of the small group. Please submit a simple session plan with the key bullet points related to their own experience as well as prompting questions for discussion according to the following timeline.

Flipcharts and pens will be available and small group facilitators are encouraged to use these to present their ideas, guide discussion and capture main points.

**Timeline for Development of Session Plan**

| | |
|---|---|
| Submission of draft session plan to EPE Organizing Committee | **21 March** |
| EPE Organizing Committee to review and share feedback | **2 April** |
| Submission of final session plan | **16 April** |


Please send your plans to: lori.bell@fao.org with copy to hampton-manley@un.org.

## Guidance for EPE Poster Session Presenters

The UNEG EPE Organizing Committee appreciates your interest in participating as a poster presenter in the EPE 2012 in Rome, hosted by FAO, WFP and IFAD from 23-24 April. We would like to provide you with some basic further guidance and timelines for the development of your presentation to ensure coordination and organization of each session.

The EPE sessions will focus on three themes identified by UNEG members as topics they are most interested to learn about and discuss. These are:

- Managing Evaluations
- Evaluation and Results Based Management
- Evaluation of Complexity

Poster sessions are a visual presentation and display of UNEG member's work, set up in an open reception area, which will enable informal discussion of practical tools and experiences. These could include presentation of tools, publications, or evaluation results in a visual way. The poster session will include refreshments to encourage an informal atmosphere.

Any hard copy materials may be displayed on a table in front of the panel.  The poster presenter will be expected to attend the EPE, to set up and be in attendance at the poster during one coffee break interval, discussing with peers who have interesting experiences to share or questions. The hosts will provide the panels, adhesive materials (tape, glue etc), flipchart paper and marker pens, and table and a chair for each poster presenter.

# Guidance for EPE Session Chairs

The UNEG EPE Organizing Committee appreciates your interest in participating as a session chair for the EPE 2012 in Rome, hosted by FAO, WFP and IFAD from 23-24 April. We would like to provide you with some basic further guidance to ensure good coordination and organization of each session.

The Session Chair presides over a designated session, facilitates the discussion, empowers participation and knowledge sharing, and moves the discussion from a descriptive to an analytical level so that lessons or principles can be developed.

He/she needs to:

- Be clear about the goals of the Session.
- Start the Session on time and begin reviewing the Session agenda.
- Manage the timing of the Session. Please make sure to arrive at least 20 min before the session starts to go over the technical requirements for webinar[8].
- Encourage participation. Before opening the floor for discussion, he/she needs to first invite inputs from webinar participants. The chair works to control dominant participants and invite shyer ones to ensure that the discussion allows for wide discussion and that decisions will be made democratically.
- Guide and encourage  discussion by suggesting links in ideas, by drawing on participants to actively engage in the discussion, and sharing knowledge.
- Bring closure to the end of the Session by summarizing the main points of the presentations and discussion while highlighting issues to be addressed, new directions noted, or good practices.
- Work with the Session Rapporteurs to summarize key ideas and outcomes from the Session. Session Chairs are requested to coordinate with the respective rapporteur(s) in drafting a more comprehensive report of the Session, which will be included in the EPE report to be prepared by the EPE OC after the event.

# Guidance for EPE Rapporteurs

The role of the Rapporteur is to coordinate with the Session Chair to discuss the session format and come to agreement as to which parts of the overall session should be documented by the Rapporteurs and which are covered by other processes (normally just plenary sessions are the responsibility of the Rapporteur).  The Rapporteur should then take summary notes of the session, capturing the following:

- Introduction

- Main points of the presentation(s)

---

[8]An EPE Organizing Committee member will be supervising the webinar participation and coordinate with you.

- Main points of the discussion

- Conclusions

- Points for action (if any)

Each Rapporteur, in cooperation with the respective Session Chair, is requested to draft a more comprehensive report on the Session for inclusion in the EPE report to be prepared by the EPE Organizing Committee after the event.

# ANNEX 5 – Invitation to EPE (sent by UNEG Chair/ Secretariat)



## Invitation to the UN Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminar

### Exchanging lessons learned among UN evaluators

### 23 and 24 April 2012, Rome, Italy

Since 2007, UNEG has organized annual Evaluation Practice Exchange (EPE) Seminars. The objective of these seminars is to allow UN evaluators to share experiences, practices and lessons in an informal setting. Therefore, the opinions expressed at EPE are the personal thinking of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNEG or UNEG Members involved.

The 2012 EPE will be in Rome, Italy with FAO, WFP and IFAD Offices of Evaluation co-hosting the session. The venue for the two-day event will be FAO. In addition, as in 2011, the seminar will be on-line for participants through Webinars. The EPE will be preceded by the NONIE Conference (which will be held at FAO on 19/20 April) and, as usual, followed by the UNEG General Meeting (AGM) on 25-27 April.

Thank you to the many UNEG members who responded to our survey on key topics of interest. Based on the priorities expressed by UNEG members through the survey, the EPE 2012 sessions (either in the form of panels, small groups, poster sessions) will be organized around the following themes:

- Managing Evaluations
- Evaluation and Results Based Management
- Evaluation of Complexity

In response to the interest expressed by EPE participants last year, we are also planning some social events to encourage networking such as a cocktail party, dinner event, and coffee opportunities with details to come closer to the EPE dates.

The detailed agenda for the EPE is under development and will be posted shortly. There will be on-line registration through the UNEG website starting in February. In the meantime, please block your calendars and start advocating for the budget to come and enjoy the evaluation learning and networking opportunities!

Best regards

Lori Bell, FAO
Emily Hampton-Manley, OIOS

30

# Annex 6 - Small group work report form

**EPE 2012 Group Work Summary Notes**
**Monday April 23, 2012-04-22**

Session Theme:  Managing Evaluations     RBM and Evaluation

Session Topic: _____     Rapporteur: _____

Participants (names)

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Key Learning Points:

|  |
|---|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Issues to take forward to AGM and/ suggestion for EPE 2013:

|  |
|---|
|  |

# Annex 7 - UNEG EPE AGM Hosting guidance

The purpose of this document is to detail the requirements for hosting the UNEG EPE and AGM. Unless otherwise stated, the host agency/ies are expected to cover any costs incurred.

| Meeting requirements | |
|---|---|
| Conference room | One large conference room (for minimum 60 pax, maximum 90 pax)[9] |
| | One small conference room to serve as a breakout room (max 30 pax)[10] |
| Conference room Facilities | Facilities to run PowerPoint presentations in the meeting room |
| | Technician in the conference room to assist with technical issues |
| | Wifi. |
| Catering | Refreshments (e.g. coffee/ tea/ juice) during the **AGM** (days 1 and 2 AM/PM, day 3, AM only) |
| | Water in the meeting room (for presenters at least). |
| | Location for the UNEG Chair's cocktail (paid for by UNEG and the UNEG Chair) |
| Other | A small room to be used by the UNEG Secretariat* |
| | Access to a printer and photocopier (UNEG Secretariat only)[11] |
| | Group photo (start of the afternoon session on the first day)* |
| | Audio recording of the AGM proceedings |
| | Host agency/ies representative to give the AGM welcome speech |
| | Focal point/s to work with the UNEG Secretariat (see below) |

* If possible

Neither the EPE or AGM require interpretation.

The designated focal point will need to:

- Liaise with in-house services including conference, security and catering services.

- Assist the UNEG Secretariat in preparing the list of local hotels, logistics note and social information document[12].

---

[9] Unless hosted in New York where it can be assumed the number of participants will be much larger.

[10] The Secretariat will confirm the need for this room when preparations for the EPE and AGM have begun.

[11] The UNEG EPE and AGM are paperless events but it is useful to have access to these facilities if needed.

- Help identify a location for the UNEG Social Dinner (a pay your own way event held on the evening of the second day) and liaise with the restaurant.

| Approximate timeline for UNEG EPE and AGM preparations (starting at the end of the previous AGM) | |
|---|---|
| ASAP after the previous AGM | Host agency/ies to identify convenient dates to host the UNEG EPE and AGM. |
| | Host agency/ies to inform the UNEG Secretariat who will then inform UNEG Heads of the chosen dates. |
| | Host agency/ies to book conference rooms. |
| AGM -3 months | Host agency/ies focal point to work with the UNEG Secretariat in preparing the list of hotels, and logistics and social information documents. |
| | Host agency/ies representative to start participating in the UNEG Coordination Committee meetings. |
| AGM -2 months | List of hotels, logistics and social information documents to be distributed to UNEG members by the UNEG Secretariat. |
| AGM -6 weeks | Draft EPE and AGM Agendas to be distributed by the UNEG Secretariat |
| AGM -4 weeks | Event registration to open (managed by the UNEG Secretariat) |
| AGM -2 weeks | Event registration closes. UNEG Secretariat will send list of confirmed participants to host agency/ies focal point for security (if required). |
| | Documents for the UNEG AGM to be posted on the UNEG website (UNEG Secretariat) |
| AGM -1 week | UNEG Secretariat to arrive in host city end of the week before the EPE/ AGM to finalise preparations. |

## Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminars/ webinars

The host agency/ies are expected to participate in the organization of the Evaluation Practice Exchange Seminars. In 2011, the EPEs were broadcast as a live webinar for the first time. The use of "new technologies" for future EPEs was subsequently endorsed at the UNEG AGM 2011, on the proviso that they did not replace the face-to-face element of the EPE.

The host agencies are not expected to have such technologies but should work with the UNEG Secretariat and other UNEG members who may have access, to run the webinars including testing prior to the event.

---

[12] See UNEG AGM 2011 Logistics and Social Information documents.