

**INTER-AGENCY WORKING GROUP ON EVALUATION
REPORT OF THE MEETING
19- 20 JUNE 19, 2002
VIENNA INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE CENTER
VIENNA, AUSTRIA**

INTRODUCTION

The annual meeting of the Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) was held in Vienna on 19 – 20 June 2002 and hosted by UNIDO. The meeting was attended by 20 of the member agencies. All present endorsed the rotation of the host and location of the meeting as a good idea and would continue in the future as it promotes ownership. The meeting agenda focused on strategic issues which included “Evaluation and Development Effectiveness” and “Independence and Transparency of Evaluation”. On methods and approaches, the agenda included sessions on “Lessons from Country Impact Assessments”, “Partnership in Monitoring and Evaluation”, and presentation of a major evaluation of global nature. Finally, the agenda also included for the first time presentations by the Chair of DAC Working Party on Evaluation and a member of the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of the Multilateral Banks. This report highlights the summary of the discussions and the recommendations as well as feedback from the four sub- working groups. (See Annex I and II for List of Participants and the Agenda)

**PART I STRATEGIC ISSUES
Evaluation and Development Effectiveness: Monterrey Consensus, Tracking
MDG, Implications**

In this session, three principal issues were highlighted. First, it was noted that the demand for evaluative evidence has increased and there is a greater interest and expectation of the evaluation function. The GA resolution following the Triennial Policy Review, which reaffirms the assessment function, and requests that a report be presented to the ECOSOC in 2002 had clearly demonstrated this. The resolution is relevant for the IAWG as it points to improving the performance of the UN system and emphasizes use of evaluative evidence and lessons learned. The involvement of countries in monitoring and evaluation was also discussed. Second, it was noted that Monterrey has highlighted the global partnership and legitimacy of the MDGs. Following the post Monterrey conference, there is however greater attention to development effectiveness and the need to work closely together. The Monterrey Conference raised the debate on whether aid works and in doing so, emphasized the importance of the evaluation function with a central focus on results and conducting transparent evaluations which combine accountability with learning. Another critical issue is the tracking of MDGs, a responsibility of both the developed and developing countries. The evaluation function needs to strategically focus on MDGs, and in light of this, the challenge is on methodologies and concepts, harmonizing evaluation approaches as well as working together.

Finally, it was noted that there is a greater emphasis on looking at evaluation as part of good governance and transparency. The challenge is to assess performance while holding people accountable. The IDEAS initiative on which UNDP is collaborating with the World Bank looks specifically at strengthening the capacity of the South to promote evaluation as part of good governance. There needs to be a balance between the issue of performance vs. need and additional efforts are required to help low income countries that are unable to meet the emerging criteria. There is also a need to balance organizational effectiveness with development effectiveness.

This first session raised the issue of joint accountability and how to move forward on joint evaluations – what is it that agencies are jointly accountable for; the need to look at methodologies and harmonizing approaches; and the need and opportunity for members to work collectively on MDGs; Evaluation Capacity Development, and other topics agencies can collectively work on e.g. globalization, education for all etc.

INDEPENDENCE AND TRANSPARENCY OF EVALUATION

The World Bank, UNESCO and the UNFPA made presentations on factors that impact on the independence and transparency of evaluations. The World Bank's presentation highlighted the difference between internal and external evaluations and noted internal evaluations were conducted by internal units for management purposes while external evaluations were undertaken by external entities from outside the organization. Self-evaluations could be critical of the organization and play a role in contributing to accountability and learning. In independent evaluations, what enhance value is the accountability, transparency, and credibility of the exercise and accessibility of evaluation reports.

The following factors were considered important for promoting independence and transparency of evaluations: organizational independence and behavioral independence (e.g. protection from outside interference in the hiring and firing decisions, ensuring that the evaluator's judgment is not overruled or subject to funding influence, prejudice, preconceived ideas), avoidance of conflict of interest (e.g. involvement of decision-makers in activities being evaluated; personal, professional, official or financial interest in evaluation); and transparency and disclosure.

In summary the key messages captured were independence does not mean isolation; full independence facilitates transparency; independence implies disclosure and this is important for ensuring transparency; and transparency is important for promoting learning and accountability.

UNESCO's presentation emphasized the fact that independence and transparency of evaluations promoted "buy-in" by those being evaluated and cited the following as critical to promoting the independence and transparency of evaluations: institutional distance/independence; the location and management of the evaluation units and support from senior management. Commitment of top management to the evaluation function was seen as critical to the independence, impartiality and objectivity of evaluations as it "allowed things to happen," irrespective of the location of unit. Independence must cover all aspects of the evaluation from planning i.e. setting of TORs, and the selection of teams to the actual conduct of the evaluation. Impartiality, the methodology selected and approach as well as the competence of team also affected the independence of evaluations.

UNFPA highlighted the key aims of UNFPA thematic evaluations as follows: to generate knowledge about good practices; to improve programme interventions; to inform decision-making and promote organizational culture and performance. Factors cited as critical to successful evaluations were credibility, an independent and unbiased process, user involvement, the evaluation design, quality of data and the analysis/interpretation. UNFPA also emphasized participation of teams, the involvement of both internals and externals and ownership of the evaluation as important to the credibility and independence of the evaluation. Formulating of recommendations is important in fostering transparency and independence. The approach should be to arrive at a process that promotes advocacy for the use of evaluation recommendations, objectivity in rendering results and a balanced representation of findings and recommendations. It was noted that the search for compromise may lead to a report so broad so as to "please everyone" or take on a corporate line, that obscures the factual accuracy of the findings. It was therefore important to preserve the independence of the evaluators in framing the findings and recommendations. Three factors that were emphasized were: independence and objectivity of

individuals involved in the evaluation; transparency of methodology and approach which should follow certain standards and established norms; and the involvement of those who will be agents of change to institutionalize the recommendations.

The plenary discussion raised the following issues:

- Integrity of the evaluation unit and disclosure policy are more important than who conducts the evaluation – use of external evaluators does not necessarily mean independence or objectivity.
- The evaluation function is also a question of perception. Evaluators need to change their image from that of “blissful reflection” to getting their organizations to work on burning issues of the day. While independence and location of the unit is important, maintaining integrity of the process and not compromising and applying methodological rigor can contribute to issues of credibility.
- There is a difference between project and programme level evaluations. The level at which evaluators package and obtain feedback for their work is important. Visibility of subject and links to core organizational issues will contribute to impact as much as independence and objectivity of evaluations .
- IDEAS is trying to respond to capacity development needs of developing countries evaluators by fostering networks where they can get together and reduce the sense of isolation.
- The knowledge group should perhaps look at the issue of to evaluations and their findings so a s to make the evaluation role more useful in contributing to organizational learning and development effectiveness.

PART II METHODS AND APPROACHES

In this third session, the discussion centered around three main topics: country level impact assessments, joint evaluations and global public goods.

COUNTRY LEVEL IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (CLIAS)

UNDP presented an overview of its experience on Country Level Impact Assessments, which it piloted in Burkina Faso, Malawi and the Philippines using triangulation methodology. With the adoption of RBM in 1999, UNDP needed to develop evaluation tools and methodologies that allowed it to gauge development results at outcome and impact levels. The purpose of the studies were therefore to assess UNDP’s contribution to development outcomes while testing the methodology for capturing development results at country level. The discussion highlighted the following points:

- The country is an important level of analysis for assessing development results and development effectiveness and for gauging an organization’s likely contribution to outcomes, but the process is complex, costly and time-consuming and fraught with the problems of poor data, loss of institutional memory, and the challenges of attribution and aggregation, which were not easy to address.
- It was possible to link UNDP’s contributions to outcomes and impact and triangulation methodology can yield plausible and credible evidence with respect to an agency’s contributions to outcomes, but it is not possible to isolate this from the contribution of other partners; suggesting that CLIAS may be best tackled through joint evaluations that includes the partner government.
- Methodologically, the key challenges were short time frames; difficulty of linking micro level or project level successes to macro level results and vice versa (aggregation);

attribution, sample size and determining significance of findings; data availability and quality.

- Lessons from CLIA are to expand use of the methodology and integrate the country level assessment into UNDP M&E results chain and not treat it as a stand alone research project; to link process to real time learning and decision-making; refine and enrich the triangulation methodology with other approaches, manage attribution; and ensure the areas being researched are manageable and have robust and reliable data; involve the country office and other partners, particularly the government.
- CLIA indicates experience at the country level is the appropriate unit of analysis to gauge development effectiveness and UNDAF and MDGs may enhance this trend.

PARTNERSHIP IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION: METHODS AND EXPERIENCES

The World Food Programme (WFP) presented a case study of an interagency needs assessment on monitoring and evaluation in Afghanistan that involved the following agencies, UNHCR/UNICEF/UNOCHA/WFP as a lessons learning experience. The study was fraught with a number of problems and produced inconclusive results. The presentation highlighted the following issues to account for the problems faced:

- There was no lead agency but an evaluation management team, which seriously impacted on decision-making. In hindsight, is important to have a lead agency to oversee the process.
- Time involved in the preparation, decision making, and reporting were major concerns; the process was rushed and no sufficient lead time;
- Full buy-in among field offices is necessary;
- The undertaking was considered as ad-hoc and additional work for evaluation units of the different agencies;
- Any future initiative must be linked to existing interagency coordination mechanisms if it is to impact on corporate decision making;
- The theme was too wide which resulted in an unfocused report;
- Key concepts/terms used were often agency specific;
- There was tension between field priorities and HQ interest;
- There should have been up-front agreement on how to handle diverging opinions – especially in the absence of a lead agency;
- There was no clarity on use of report;
- The team at the field should have been accompanied by an evaluation management team member.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THE UN STRATEGIC SYSTEM PLAN (UNSSP) ON HIV/AIDS

The UNAIDS demonstrated a case on experience with interagency cooperation on monitoring and evaluation work through the UN system platform for collaboration on HIV/AIDS. Developed within the overall context of the Global Strategy Framework adopted by the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in December 2000 the UNSSP identifies key function of the UN system in support of national efforts and describes the approach and priorities of the participating UN system organizations in a coordinated UN system response. A performance monitoring review concluded that reporting at the specific agency level had been patchy, suggesting the development of a culture of performance-based monitoring and reporting has some way to go in many organizations. Lessons drawn from the analysis were presented:

- The need for ownership of the output (result) specification and its associated performance indicators by those responsible for their implementation.

- The institutional culture needs to develop a results or performance ethic that is realistic in terms of the context in which programmes are implemented.
- Responsibility and accountability for delivering outputs needs to be clearly defined.
- Reporting requirements need to balance comprehensiveness and simplicity.
- Effective performance monitoring is a two-way process.

PARTNERSHIP IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION: METHOD AND EXPERIENCES

GLOBAL PUBLIC GOODS

The World Bank presented the work it is conducting on Global Public Goods. The presentation highlighted that the Bank has 70 global programs in diverse activities. Out of these, 21 provide global or country investment, while 55 provide country-level technical assistance and 63 exchange knowledge on best practices. It was established that out of these programmes, 14 provide genuine global public goods and only 2 are involved in global public policy formulation and 5 in new standard setting, though such activities could help level the playing field for developing countries. Major findings that were presented include:

- It is unclear how effective global programs are in exchanging relevant information and in enabling developing countries to access new knowledge.
- Developing countries participate in global programs mainly as implementers: they have little voice in the design, governance, and management of global programs.
- The responsibilities and obligations of partners are not sufficiently spelled out and understood by partners, thus creating avoidable implementation risks.
- A distinctive global strategy for the Bank is missing: selectivity is largely exercised at the level of individual programs.
- There is divergence between the way global funds are spent at the global level and that at the national level - e.g. CGIAR and agricultural research.

The discussion raised the issue as to whether it would be desirable for the Bank and UN organizations to undertake parallel or joint evaluations, among other things, to address issues of comparative advantage in global public goods. One possibility raised was to cluster around the millennium goals in order to rally partners. Questions were also raised as to regional and sub-regional perspectives.

AWARD PRESENTATION

IAWG in the past has honored personalities within the UN system for distinguished service and excellence in the evaluation domain. This year that honor was awarded to Mr. Bob Picciotto – Director General of OED since 1992 for distinguished service in recognition of his long years of service and outstanding contributions to the fields of evaluation practice and to the IAWG.

Part III Report By The IAWG Secretary

A report on the financial situation was presented by the IAWG secretary. At the last meeting it was agreed to have voluntary contributions to support the functioning of the IAWG Secretariat. To date contributions have been received from FAO, IFAD, UNDP, UNHCR, IOM, UNFPA, UNICEF – totaling \$ 58,000. Members who have not yet contributed were encouraged to do so. It was noted that for 2001, the web site has been developed and the funds will enable it to function until 2003. However, if the group identifies other activities, additional funds will be required. The Secretary also mentioned that initial discussions with DFID were undertaken regarding additional funding and the group will be informed of possibilities.

REPORT FROM GROUP CHAMPIONS

At the IAWG meeting in 2001, four thematic groups were created to enhance programmatic work led by a Lead Member: Evaluation Capacity Development (World Bank), UNDAF (UNFPA), Norms and Standards (UNICEF), Knowledge and Learning Group (UNDP)). During the IAWG meeting this year, a session was dedicated to group work, where each group deliberated on past experience and identified more specific issue based work which could be initiated for the next year. The group champions reported back to plenary on the discussion as follow:

EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT (WORLD BANK)

The group has shared information. The finalized report on evaluation capacity will be shared with group members. The ECD group requires clarification and will share information with those that respond to this on both planned and completed activities and do a matrix on ECD joint activities that will be presented to the Spring IAWG meeting. The group will focus on setting standards for good evaluations.

WORKING GROUP ON UNDAF (UNFPA)

This group could not meet. In early 2002 it made contact with that task force of UNDG to update CCA/UNDAF and provided input on monitoring and evaluation guidelines. The revised guidelines were circulated in April but the response was reflective of very little interest among members. In light of UNDG reforms and the fact that new CCA/ UNDAF guidelines were in place, it was decided to put UNDAF to rest since the context has shifted to system wide interest and focus on MDGs. The Group will now focus on demonstrating how the IAWG is contributing to MDGs and on methodology issues. UNIDO, ILO, UNESCO, UNCDF, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP expressed interest in the MDG group.

Norms And STANDARDS (UNICEF)

The group reconfirmed a commitment to draft a framework on norms and standards based on an initial framework discussed at the IAWG meeting and in September a first draft would be circulated using the IAWG website as meeting place. The OECD/DAC glossary of terms would be used as a basis and any discrepancies would be raised at the meeting next year. The group will prepare a framework for September to be circulated on the web and presented to the IAWG meeting next year.

KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING GROUP (UNDP)

The Knowledge and Learning group sent out a questionnaire to all the agencies on the role of knowledge and learning and topics the group should focus on. Responses show that quite a number of agencies have knowledge strategies and have developed web sites on KM and members wanted to focus on sharing of information and knowledge, promoting learning through joint evaluations, participation in each other's evaluations and hosting and exchanging information on the websites. In 2002/2003, the Group's work plan will focus on promoting connectivity and IT-enabled information sharing among the agencies, bringing the information onto a common platform, and sharing and posting of evaluation plans and summaries and events on the IAWG website. It was suggested that the K&L group could have an IAWG web-based community of practice and focus more on promoting interagency learning on issues that link action research and evaluations.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLENARY

- Change the name from champions to focal points;
- UNDAF Group: Given that the context has shifted and the system wide interest on MDGs need to show how we are contributing to MDGs. This group will concentrate on MDGs as UNDAF issues are already been handled through the harmonization and simplification group.
- Enhance greater use of IAWG web site for inter-group exchange.
- All the task forces should present work plans by the end July.

HARMONIZATION AND PARTNERSHIP

For the first time, the IAWG meeting invited presentations from the Chair of DAC Working Party on Evaluation and Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of the Multilateral Banks. This session focused specifically on harmonization efforts undertaken so far, including the UN system, as well as potential partnership initiatives.

The chair of the DAC Working Party on Evaluation, the World Bank and UNDP addressed the IAWG meeting on the subject of harmonization and partnerships and covered the subject from the perspective of the DAC, the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) and the UN system, respectively. The Chair of the DAC Working Party on Evaluation, Mr. Rob van den Berg, noted that the evaluation community was divided into the UN system, the International Financial Institutions (IFIs), the DAC which represented bilateral donors and developed countries and NGOs community with evaluation capacity. As with previous speakers, he also noted that the Monterrey consensus, adoption of MDGs and PRSPs signified growing consensus among donors and their development partners on the role international development partners should play. There was increasing convergence in policy areas indicating better integration of approaches and a clear understanding that development is not about discrete sector-specific initiatives but rather about holistic integrated approaches. Collaboration in the evaluation field was growing but this was not as significant as it should given the marked converged in development policy areas. For example, the Netherlands database of evaluations has thousands of reports on project evaluations, some 200 reports on programme-level evaluations and only 50 reports in the policy areas or at macro-level. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs has only 10 joint evaluations on record. DAC priorities of work were (i) joint work with other partners; (ii) evaluation capacity development and (iii) methods and approach. It was too early to tell what form the evaluation capacity development would take but the DAC would keep IAWG informed as a way of increasing connectivity within the evaluation community. One suggestion was to open each other's websites to promote learning from each other. In March 2003, the DAC Working Party on Evaluation is organizing a workshop to be hosted by France in Paris to bring together the evaluation community. The UN system, NGOs in partner countries were expected to be invited.

The World Bank noted that the ECG of the Multilateral Development Banks includes the World Bank, the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the European Investment Bank. In the new evaluation architecture, the IAWG, the DAC and the ECG could join governments, the private sector and civil society in evaluations centered on the MDGs. New practice standards were being set up for evaluations and most of the ECGs were doing country level evaluations. The World Bank had done 53 country assistance evaluations to date. The ECG needed to work on harmonization of approaches that would facilitate joint evaluations and on Evaluation Capacity Development, an important area of work for the group. The ECG now has

stand alone websites which hosts ad hoc findings from various evaluations and produces a newsletter entitled **Evaluation Insights**.

UNDP gave an overview of efforts being made by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) to foster harmonization and simplification among the UN agencies. The objectives and benefits of UN system harmonization were to minimize transaction costs for programme countries; raise development effectiveness and increase the impact of UN interventions; and reduce transaction costs and workloads for the UN agencies.

There has been some progress towards greater harmonization since the Secretary General's first round of reforms. UN programme cycles have been harmonized and there has been an integration of Country Programmes into the Common Country Assessments (CCAs) and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). To enhance the harmonization process, the following issues are addressed:

- Harmonization of the practice of preparation and approval of country programme and approval, joint programmes and the adoption of single programme action plans;
- Adoption of Results Based Management (RBM) terms and practice as commonly used in DAC /OECD glossary of terms;
- Conduct of outcome evaluation of UNDAF with individual Country Programme mid-term reviews;
- Developing an outcome and resource matrix;
- Convening joint strategy meetings to reduce workloads for governments;
- Harmonizing of Executive Board documents;
- Harmonized approaches to national execution, standardized co-financing arrangements, annual work plans and standardized format for donor reporting
- Common approach to monitoring and evaluation and integrated Monitoring & Evaluation Plans and the conduct of outcome evaluations;

To date there has been brainstorming sessions which took place in April and a work plan was submitted to ECOSOC following is review of recommendations by the EXCOM.

PART IV CONCLUSION

The last segment of the meeting provided a brief overview and wrap up of the key issues that the meeting had covered. Below is a summary of key issues highlighted:

- 1) Global consensus on Monterrey and agreement on MDGs was changing the way agencies were doing business. There was now a greater focus on development results and effectiveness and thus increased demand for credible evaluations. The emerging challenges are that the agenda of the day requires all agencies to come together and build strong partnerships and to place importance on sharing experience and lessons learning and linking evaluations to real time decision making.
- 2) Concerns of organizational effectiveness did not receive effective attention before but now this is linked to development effectiveness; and experience and lessons from evaluation have to be relevant, accessible, knowledge driven and real-time.
- 3) Capacity development for evaluation (ECD) issues were clearly important but the kind of capacity now required was to enable evaluators to move away from project level to programme and country level analysis. There is the challenge need for tools and new methodologies on how partners look at shared accountability for tracking MDGs.
- 4) Harmonize evaluation approaches to reduce transaction costs and better track development results.

- 5) On the demand side for evaluation in decision-making, different organizations have different experiences and good practices that can be shared. There is a need to assess how good practices are working in different agencies – e.g. scorecards and to create demand for change. UNCEB presents an opportunity for different agencies to work on strengthening evaluation practice.
- 6) Independence and transparency and high level organizational support enhances credibility and integrity of evaluations. Credibility is connected to how well the exercise is done and linked to use of good methodologies and doing quality work.
- 7) How to make lessons from evaluation make a difference in practice and mainstream them is a challenge that will ultimately determine the effectiveness of the evaluation function. Supply and demand have to connect.
- 8) The IT revolution has expanded tools and opportunities for sharing knowledge/learning across agencies. Great potential of IAWG website and Development Gateway and other search engines to strategically share, use and access information and knowledge (e.g. joint evaluation experience, lessons, glossary of terms etc).
- 9) Evaluation architecture is changing. There are many groups with links to UNCEB and clusters of communities – e.g. DAC; ECG; IAWG .The challenge is to connect the 3 groups in different ways and link them through IDEAS with evaluation communities from the South. Joint evaluation and experiences should be encouraged and members should identify what they can do jointly.

NEXT STEPS:

- 1) Lead members for theme groups will submit work plans with budgets by end July which will be consolidated by the IAWG secretariat.
- 2) Although considered too soon, opportunities will be explored to see whether the next IAWG meeting could be held at the same time as the DAC Partnership Forum in March 2003. UNESCO was proposed to be the host (subject to confirmation).
- 3) IDEAS will be held from 9-11 September 2002 and members will be informed of the venue of the launch. Formal invitation will be sent only to interested members in their personal capacities.

ANNEX I

IAWG PARTICIPANTS LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE/ ORGANIZATION</u>
Carsten Hyttel	Programmer Manager, UNDCP
Mario Marchich	UNIDO
Donatella Magliani	UNIDO
Cristina Albertin	UNDCP, Programme Manager
Muki Daniel Jerneloev	UNDCP, Programme Management Officer
Naveen Sarna	OED/ World Bank
Uma Lele	OED/ World Bank
Osvaldo Feinstein	OED/ World Bank Manager
Luca Brusa	Evaluation Unit/ UN Volunteers
Olav Hernar	UNESCO, Evaluation Specialist
Susanne Bech	UNEP/JPO
Segbedzi Norgbey	UNEP, Officer-in charge, EDU
Backson Sibanda	UNESCO-IOE- Chief of Evaluation
Linda Sherry Cloonan	Deputy Chief, OOE/ UNFPA
Dominik Bartsch	UNHCR, SNR Policy Officer
Hans Heep	Oil Director UNIDO Evaluation
EchHard W. Hein	Secretary HLCP/ CEB Secretariat
Kees Tuinenburg	Qir Evaluation, WFP
Maya Bachner	Sen evaluation officer, WIPO
Silvia Vincenti	Ass Ev Officer, WIPO
Paul Rolian	Director, Technical Cooperation Audit, WTO
Eddie Yee-Woo Guo	Chief, Evaluation Unit, UNCDF
Jean Claude Piers de Raveschoot	Senior M & E Officer, ITC
Mario de Zamaroczy	Advisor, Office Tech. Assistance Management, IMF
Iqbal Ahmed	Head of Evaluation Department, ILO
Carla Henry	Bureau of Programming and Management, ILO
Rosina Salerno	Head, Programme Evaluation, IAEA
Masa Kato	FAO
Drinko Kurevija	Industrial Development Organization, UN
Massimo D'Angelo	Department of Economic And Social Affairs, UN
Khalid Malik	Director, UNDP Evaluation Office
Nurul Alam	Deputy Director, UNDP Evaluation Office
Fadzai Gwaradzimba	Evaluation Advisor, UNDP Evaluation Office
Ruby Sandhu-Rojon	Evaluation Advisor, UNDP Evaluation Office

ANNEX II

Meeting Agenda for the IAWG on Evaluation 19-20 June 2002 Vienna International Centre Vienna, Austria

Wednesday: 19 June 2002

Part I

9:30 – 10:00

Opening Remarks

Angelo D'Ambrosio, Managing Director, UNIDO
Khalid Malik, IAWG Chair

Organization of the Meeting

M. Nurul Alam, Secretary IAWG

10:00 – 11:15

Strategic Issue: Chair Khalid Malik

Evaluation and Development Effectiveness

! Monterrey Consensus

(Robert Picciotto, World Bank and Khalid Malik)

! Tracking Millennium Development Goals

(Jean Quesnel, UNICEF)

PP Presentation #1

! Implications of Recent GA Resolutions

(Massimo D'Angelo/ Roger Maconick, UN DESA)

Discussion

11:15 – 11:30

Coffee Break

11:30 – 12:30

Independence and Transparency of Evaluation

PP Presentation #2

(Osvaldo Feinstein, World Bank; Backson Sibanda UNESCO;

Linda Sherry-Cloonan UNFPA)

PP Presentation #3

12:30 – 13:00

International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)

(Robert Picciotto, Khalid Malik)

13:00 – 14:30

Lunch

Part II

14:30 – 15:45

Chair: Jean Quesnel

Methods and Approaches

Lessons from Country Impact Assessments

(Fadzai Gwaradzimba, UNDP)

PP Presentation #4

Partnership in Monitoring and Evaluation: Methods and Experiences

(Kees Tuinenburg, WFP; Jim Sherry, UNAIDS)

Discussion

PP Presentation #5

PP Presentation #6

15:45 – 16:00

Coffee Break

16:00 – 17:00

Evaluation Presentation: Global Public Policies and Programmes

(Uma Lele, World Bank)

PP Presentation #7

Discussion

17:00 – 17:30

Award Ceremony for Excellence in Evaluation

18:30

Reception by IAWG Chair

**Meeting Agenda for the IAWG on Evaluation
19-20 June 2002
Vienna International Centre
Vienna, Austria**

Thursday: 20 June 2002

Part I		Chair: Luciano Lavizzari, IFAD	
9:30 – 10:00		Report by IAWG Secretary	
		Report from Group Champions	
10:00 – 11:15		Break out Group Discussions on “Making IAWG Work”	
11:15 – 11:30		Coffee Break	
11:30 – 13:00		Harmonization and Partnership	
		‣ DAC: Statement by Chair, DAC Working Party on Evaluation, (Rob van den Berg)	
		‣ Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of Multilateral Development Banks (Osvaldo Feinstein, World Bank)	
		‣ UN System (Ruby Sandhu Rojon, UNDP)	<u>PP Presentation #8</u>
13:00 – 14:30		Lunch	
Part II		Chair: Khalid Malik	
14:30 – 15:30		Plenary	
		Presentation by Break out Groups	
		‣ Knowledge and Learning	
		‣ Norms and Standards	
		‣ UNDAF and MDGs	
		‣ Evaluation Capacity Development	
		Work-plan for 2002-2003	
15:30 – 15:45		Coffee Break	
15:45 – 16:30		Conclusion and Wrap up	