

UNHCR Management Response – UNEG/DAC Peer Review			
Title:	UNEG/DAC Professional Peer Review of the Evaluation Function at the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)		
Entity that commissioned the Review:	Office of the High Commissioner, UNHCR		
Due date of Management Response:	15 October 2021		
Coordinator of Management Response:	Lori Bell	Head of Evaluation Service (ES)	Geneva (HQ), Switzerland
Management Response approved	Filippo Grandi 	High Commissioner	Geneva (HQ), Switzerland
Date:	14 February, 2022		

General comments on the evaluation:	<i>UNHCR would like to acknowledge and thank the Peer Review Panel for their time and commitment to the exercise – specifically Andrea Cook (WFP), Susan Kyle (US/PRM), Demetra Arapakos (OIOS), Johan Schaar (ALNAP), Antoine Ouellet-Drouin (ex-ICRC) and Nanna Hvidt (MoFA/Denmark) and Daniel Arghiros (independent consultant)</i> <i>The Peer Review (PR) has provided assurance that UNHCR is on the right track, has brought in new ideas and provided an important reality check on the pace of change in expanding the coverage of evaluation given other major reforms ongoing in the organization.</i> <i>In a technical sense, the recommendations will help further strengthen evaluation capacities, quality, coverage and use within the organization – both for the purpose of promoting learning, course correction and the scaling up of good practices as well as for promoting accountability and transparency, providing reassurance to those who fund the organizations work as well as to the Governments with whom we work to protect and support persons of concern.</i> <i>The organisation would have appreciated additional reflection on how to strengthen the evaluation function in the context of the organisation's ongoing transformation, the lessons of the pandemic and the future of work. The organization is committed to bringing these and other forward-leaning perspectives into future discussions regarding the implementation of the PR recommendations and the development of the new evaluation policy and strategy.</i>
--	--

RECOMMENDATION 1:		<i>To help guide the development of an effective evaluation function across UNHCR, the Panel recommends the following measures:</i> <i>1.1) Senior management and the Evaluation Service should consider how they can establish a forum to jointly guide the development of the evaluation function - for example with an Evaluation Function Steering Group – particularly with a view to building engagement on plans to support decentralized evaluation.</i> <i>1.2) UNHCR consider introducing a metric related to the use of evaluation in the performance goals of senior managers.</i>				
Management response:		Agree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):		<i>Evaluation can be included in standard job descriptions of senior managers with linkages to their responsibilities for maintaining adequate oversight mechanisms. In the short to medium term the emphasis on metrics needs to be directed (as suggested elsewhere in PR report) at establishing coverage norms for centralized and decentralized evaluations which can be monitored and reported on.</i>				
Unit or function responsible:		<i>Deputy High Commissioner (DHC)</i>				
Top-line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
1	<i>The new policy and strategy will include clear reference to the Senior Executive Team (SET) as the principle governance and steering structure for the evaluation function .</i>	<i>SET</i>	<i>The DHC will convene a final meeting of the reference group to discuss how to ensure support and engagement for implementation of these recommendations, especially around developing the evaluation function and supporting decentralised evaluations.</i> <i>The Evaluation Service will explore how to better engage regional bureaus and country offices in a strategic discussion on decentralized evaluations through the existing Field Reference Group.</i>	<i>Q4 2022</i>		
2	<i>Use of evaluation and other evidence in the formulation of policies,</i>	<i>Division of Strategic Planning &</i>	<i>The RBM and ES units will work to ensure expectations are clear in terms of evaluation planning, conduct and use at country and regional levels – and compliance will be monitored.</i>	<i>Q4 2022</i>		

	<i>strategies and country programmes will be further emphasized in organizational guidance, strategy and planning.</i>	<i>Results (DSPR) and ES</i>				
3	<i>Review and redesign of the competency framework for senior management positions to explore the inclusion of evidence-based decision-making and data literacy as a competency area.</i>	<i>Division of Human Resources (DHR)</i>	<i>The competency framework is one of several important basis used for decisions related to recruitment, performance measurement and career advancement.</i>	<i>Q4 2022</i>		
<i>RECOMMENDATION 2:</i> <i>RECOMMENDATION 9:</i>		<i>The next Evaluation Policy should establish the following:</i> <i>a) Clarify the term limit for the Head of the Evaluation Service and confirm whether the incumbent can take another post in UNHCR after this role (best practice would suggest not).</i> <i>b) Regarding recruitment for the Head of the Evaluation Service position, the Panel recommends that the High Commissioner makes the appointment in consultation with the Independent Audit and Oversight Committee (IAOC) – as is required for the appointment of the Inspector General, and that a member of the IAOC should also be a recruitment panel member.</i> <i>C) Regarding the dismissal of the Head of the Evaluation Service, the Panel recommends that the next Evaluation Policy requires the High Commissioner to decide “following advice of the IAOC and in consultation with the Chair of Excom”, mirroring conditions relating to the Inspector General (the Independence Oversight Policy will also need to be revised to reflect this).</i> <i>The Panel recommends a senior evaluation specialist is added as a permanent member of the Independent Audit and</i>				

	<i>Oversight Committee (e.g., an individual who held a senior role in the evaluation function of another UN function).</i>
Management response:	Partially agree
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	<i>UNHCR agrees that it would be appropriate to further strengthen safeguards to the independence of the Head of Evaluation position.</i> <i>In this respect, UNHCR agrees that clarifying issues related to the term for the Head of Evaluation, and the possibility of further employment with the organisation, would be helpful.</i> <i>However, the involvement of the IAOC in the selection and dismissal of the Head of the Evaluation Service, or to the presence of a senior evaluation specialist within IAOC membership is not appropriate given their mandate and Terms of Reference.</i> <i>Indeed, the rationale underpinning the role of the IAOC in the selection and possible dismissal of UNHCR's Inspector General (a role that is more limited than that included in the above recommendation) is intrinsically linked to the particular sensitivities of that function, a situation that is not mirrored by the function of Head of the Evaluation Service.</i> <i>Beyond differences linked to the nature of the Evaluation Head and Inspector General functions, UNHCR notes that the IAOC plays an important role advising the High Commissioner and the Executive Committee regarding the functioning of audit and oversight in UNHCR- a role that risks being compromised were the IAOC to take on the additional functions suggested. Indeed, implementing recommendation 2 in full would extend the role of the IAOC beyond its advisory nature and into an executive or quasi-executive role, in breach of its own terms of reference.</i> <i>Given the independence of the IG, and his/her role ensuring the coherence of oversight activities under the policy on independent oversight, UNHCR believes that it would be more appropriate for the IG to play an advisory role in the selection and potential dismissal of the head of the Evaluation Service.</i> <i>Regarding recommendation 9, UNHCR notes that given the composition of the IAOC (5 members appointed for a three-year mandate renewable once) and their required experience as outlined in the IAOC TORs, it is neither practical nor desirable to have one of these members be an Evaluation Specialist (which would limit IAOC's ability to advise on the full range of issues included in its TORs), and mandating this would require both a significant expansion in the number of IAOC members and a reformulation of their required experience. This notwithstanding, Evaluation remains one of the areas of experience noted as desirable for IAOC members in the committee's terms of reference and this will therefore remain a relevant consideration in the selection of upcoming IAOC members.</i>

<i>Unit or function responsible:</i>		<i>HC</i>				
<i>Top-line planned actions</i>		<i>By whom</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Progress</i>	
					<i>Status</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>The next evaluation policy 2022-2026 will include a provision with respect to term limit, the right of re-entry, and an advisory role for the IG in the selection and potential dismissal of the Head of Evaluation Service.</i>	<i>ES</i>	<i>ES will reflect the HC decision on this issue in the revised evaluation policy 2022-2026</i>	<i>Q1 2022</i>		

RECOMMENDATION 3:		<i>The Panel recommends that the next Evaluation Policy identifies a five-year target percentage of total UNHCR expenditure dedicated to the evaluation function, broken down into annual increments. This target should be set at a level that allows UNHCR to establish a fully operational evaluation function (i.e., centralized and decentralized evaluations).</i>				
Management response:		Do Not Agree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):		<i>Targets and percentages are not the right approach to looking at resourcing of the evaluation function at UNHCR. Instead, and as recommended elsewhere in the recommendations (R5), coverage norms established under the new evaluation policy and strategy will provide the rationale for budget allocations for evaluation. Such an approach will ensure that the size and structure of the function is fit for purpose vis a vis the organization and its operations.</i>				
Unit or function responsible:						
Top-line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
RECOMMENDATION 4:		<i>The Panel recommends that the next Evaluation Policy extends the current 50% specialist/50% rotational staffing model, and that UNHCR continues to facilitate its implementation.</i>				
Management response:		Agree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):						
Unit or function responsible:		<i>Evaluation Service and DHR</i>				
Top-line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
1	DHR will undertake to support Evaluation Service in ensuring its goal of finding the balance between attracting outside talent, nourishing inside talent and maintaining the independence of the function, acknowledging	DHR	UNHCR is currently reviewing the definition of an expert positions.			

	<i>that in order to do so, the recommendation that 50 percent of evaluation professional positions be considered as expert under the current definition.</i>					
2	<i>The next policy will reaffirm the target of 50/50 expert and standard/rotational positions and measures will be put in place to maximize the benefits from both types of staffing.</i>	<i>Evaluation Service</i>	<i>This arrangement requires that rotational staff benefit from systematic evaluation training on entry – and that staff being brought into the Evaluation Service on expert positions have a full orientation to the work of the organization at all levels.</i>	<i>Q1/2022</i>		

RECOMMENDATION 5:	<i>The Panel recommends the Evaluation Service, in collaboration with management, takes the following steps to strengthen evaluation planning:</i> <i>5.1) It is recommended that the Evaluation Service build in a structured consultative process to define coverage. This would include discussions with management and oversight bodies, and the Evaluation Service will need to balance demand with its capacity to deliver.</i> <i>5.2) Consistently invest in the planning and scoping of centralized evaluations, so the evaluation is sequenced with key decision-making processes (e.g. the design of a new policy or approach) and deliver findings to support them.</i> <i>5.3) Define the coverage norms for various kinds of evaluation so that coverage plans best meet the strategic needs of UNHCR. To do this, in turn, the Evaluation Service will need to:</i> <i>a) Map out the UNHCR policy universe (which appears very broad) and then define what, within this, constitutes an appropriate level of evaluation coverage.</i> <i>b) For strategic/thematic evaluations conduct a consultative review of priorities together with UNHCR management to inform the rolling workplan.</i> <i>c) Determine appropriate coverage and a consistent methodological approach for Country Strategy Evaluations considering the shift to multi-year country programmes.</i> <i>d) Ensure appropriately balanced coverage for evaluations of L3 responses taking account other evaluations (namely, country programme evaluation coverage/ protracted emergencies/multi-country emergencies/ inter agency humanitarian evaluations) and audits.</i> <i>5.4) Consider integrating an approach to work planning at the centralized level that prioritises evaluands which will add the most strategic value to the organisation. Criteria to consider include: value, profile, or whether there is an intention to scale up replicate a novel approach. In time, the Evaluation Service could also encourage Regional Bureaux and country offices to pursue the same approach for decentralized evaluations.</i> <i>5.5) Consider how the Evaluation Service wants UNHCR to engage with system-wide evaluations and UNSDCF evaluations. Engagement will need to be factored into the centralized evaluation workplan, and guidance given for how regional and country operations should engage, given capacity requirements and availability.</i>
--------------------------	---

		5.6) Clarify the budget norms for various kinds of decentralized evaluations. This would help units that are considering commissioning different kinds of decentralized evaluations to budget appropriately from the outset.				
Management response:		Agree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):		The Evaluation Service agrees overall with the recommendation and the majority of sub-recommendations, many of which reflect existing practice in the ES and evaluation function more widely. 5.3d) UNHCR does not fully understand this recommendation, as L3 evaluations come in response to L3 emergencies being declared (as required under both the current evaluation and emergency policies). Where an L3 evaluation is taking place in a country where other evaluative activity is going on (e.g. a CSE) the delineation of what issues are covered by which evaluation are carefully considered. This recommendation appears to come specifically from WFPs own practice of undertaking CSEs in humanitarian crisis context (rather than L3 specific evaluations). 5.5) Partially Agree. At the regional level, where UNHCR has limited evaluation capacity (currently only 3 of 7 regions with evaluation officers), UNHCR will consider where it's appropriate to engage with UNSCDF evaluations, based on the focus (vis-à-vis UNHCR's POC and areas of activity). ES is actively engaged in joint evaluations both at global and regional levels and has played a leadership role in the drafting of a proposal for the system-wide evaluation policy.				
Unit or function responsible:		Evaluation Service				
Top-line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
1	Utilize the policy update process to incorporate a coverage norm for different types of evaluations through a consultative process	ES	A coverage norm is recognized to be a valuable pillar to guide evaluation practice but should not be a 'straight jacket' to address emerging priorities. The coverage norm, therefore, would not be expected to be the sole parameter defining workplans for centralized and decentralized evaluations.	Q1, 2022		
	Develop a costed evaluation function budget based on the agreed coverage norms against which budget allocations can be made at different levels.	ES	As per the current policy, the HC (CEs) and Directors and Representatives (DEs) approve evaluation plans and make budgets available as part of regular annual organizational planning and budgeting exercises.	Q3, 2022		

2	<i>Establish institutional entry points and engage in consultations for mainstreaming evaluation into policy and strategy formulation and review</i>	<i>ES/DSPR/Transformation Coordination Service (TCS)</i>	<i>The updating of Strategic Directions and formulation of 8 sub-strategies under Focus Areas represents an opportunity to further align strategic evaluations with organizational priorities.</i>	<i>Q4, 2022</i>		
3	<i>Strengthen the guidance on budgeting for evaluation at the decentralized level</i>	<i>ES</i>	<i>The ES continues to engage with senior management in HQ and RB Directors and Heads of Strategic Planning regarding the earmarking of resources for evaluation based on evaluation in M&E work plans. ES continues to budget for a contingency to support decentralized evaluations with top-ups where required. This approach is intentional based on growing demand, rather than imposed from above which ES feels, in consultation with senior management and others, is not appropriate at this point in the reforms. Existing guidance on budgeting for DEs exists in the decentralized guidelines but will be reinforced to build on learning over the past year, and to align to changes in the RBM system.</i>	<i>Q2, 2022</i>		

RECOMMENDATION 6:		<i>To enhance the credibility and utility of evaluations the Panel recommends the Evaluation Service consider how it can:</i> <i>6.1) Further strengthen the quality of engagement with the evaluand throughout the evaluation process, and through key touch points, to enhance the uptake and use of evaluations.</i> <i>6.2) Seek to reduce the time taken to undertake centralized evaluations – from start to finish – to enhance the relevance of evaluation findings; and take steps to ensure the timely completion of evaluations – in line with agreed timelines - so they do feed into the decision points anticipated at the planning stage.</i> <i>6.3) Continue to carefully safeguard the quality of evaluations, given that weaker evaluations undermine the perception of utility and cause reputational damage.</i> <i>6.4) To better meet demand for strategic learning and faster feedback loops the Panel recommends the Evaluation Service:</i> <i>a) Consider deploying more developmental and formative evaluations.</i> <i>b) Consider conducting rapid evaluations when faster feedback is necessary. These will require “lighter and faster” methodologies and would emphasise learning over accountability.</i>				
Management response:		Agree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):		The Evaluation Service agrees with the overall recommendation and with many of the sub-recommendations, most of which reflect existing practice in the ES and evaluation function more widely.				
Unit or function responsible:		Evaluation Service				
Top-line planned actions		By whom	Comment	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
1	Contribute to the Emergency Policy to incorporate revised norms and additional guidance on early real-time reviews and evaluations.	Evaluation Service, DESS	UNHCR DESS is updating the emergency preparedness and response policy, with ES input with regard to evaluation norms, timing and process. Internal audit will also need to be part of the discussion to ensure oversight coordination.	Q1, 2022		
2	Prepare a guidance note on Emergency Response Evaluations to assist evaluation managers	Evaluation Service	Detailed guidelines will be prepared to assist Evaluation Managers strengthen the timeliness and quality of the EREs.	Q3, 2022		

3	<i>Refresh institutional long term agreements for the provision of humanitarian evaluation experts for evaluation teams</i>	<i>Evaluation Service</i>	<i>Framework agreements help to ensure that evaluation teams can be recruited more quickly i.e. through a lighter secondary bidding process.</i>	<i>Q4, 2021</i>		
4	<i>Further strengthen the external quality assurance process for centralized and decentralized evaluations</i>	<i>Evaluation Service</i>	<i>All final evaluation reports are currently reviewed and rated for quality. Going forward, draft TORs, inception report and draft final reports will be reviewed. Quality ratings will be published to incentivize evaluation management excellence.</i>	<i>Q1, 2022</i>		
5	<i>Take stock and prepare guidance on the conduct of more formative longitudinal evaluations.</i>	<i>Evaluation Service</i>	<i>2018-2021 longitudinal evaluations – humanitarian/development nexus, AGD policy, VenSit.</i>	<i>Q4, 2022</i>		
RECOMMENDATION 7:		<i>To further develop the <u>decentralized evaluation function</u>, the Panel recommends the Evaluation Service considers the following:</i> <i>7.1) The Panel recommends the Evaluation Service sets out the governance of the decentralized evaluation function, and expectations and roles and responsibilities of all parties, and a phased approach to roll-out in a short strategy document – that is developed in consultation with senior managers.</i> <i>7.2) The Evaluation Service needs to consider how it can support the development of the decentralized evaluation function from Geneva more intensively.</i> <i>7.3) To build regional ownership of evaluation the Panel recommends that all Senior Regional Evaluation Officers report to the Regional Director/Deputy Regional Director, with a ‘dotted’ technical reporting line to the Evaluation Service.</i> <i>7.4) UNHCR will more effectively develop an evaluation culture and practices outside Geneva if there is dedicated support in all Regional Bureaux: the Panel recommends UNHCR deploys Senior Regional Evaluation Officer in all the Regional Bureaux.</i> <i>7.6) The Evaluation Service needs to consider how to ringfence funds for decentralized evaluations – to ensure that a lack of finance does not prevent Regional Bureaux or country offices from commissioning evaluations. The Panel recommends that the Evaluation Service consider whether it wants to establish a special facility to complement country office funds for decentralized evaluations – with something like the equivalent of WFP’s Contingency Evaluation Fund.</i>				

	7.7) The Panel recommends that the Evaluation Service should commission a consultant to review the implementation of its strategy to establish the decentralized evaluation function after two to three years to inform course correction. This would provide the Evaluation Service with information to adapt its strategy, if necessary.
Management response:	Partially agree
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	The Evaluation Service partly agrees with the recommendation and majority of the sub-recommendations, many of which reflect and build on existing practice and thinking, as follows: 7.2 Partly Agree. The Evaluation Strategy (2018-22) includes a plan for and the deployment of senior evaluation officers (RSEOs) in each regional bureau. By the end of 2021, three of seven regions have RSEOs. These positions are a critical first step to establishing the demand and business case for decentralized or embedded evaluation in the organization, and links firmly with the regionalization and decentralization processes, first and second line roles, and results-based management. As an interim measure, Geneva based evaluation staff responsible for centralized evaluations can intensify their support for decentralized evaluations – but this may come at the cost of quality and coverage of centralized evaluations. 7.3 Partly agree. The Evaluation Service, as the overseer/coordinator of the evaluation function, has a medium-term plan to build the culture and demand for evaluation – both to commission and to use – in regional bureaux and large operations. To do so, the outpost SREOs currently report to the Head of Evaluation through the Senior Evaluation Coordinator, and with a dotted line to the Head of Strategic Planning or Director of the Bureau. Were this to change now the belief is that these positions might be undermined or at risk, as insufficient demand has yet been built for the recognition of the value addition of the position. The Evaluation Service will review this in 2024 to see whether a change is warranted, in line with UNHCRs own regionalization/decentralization and some of the more well-established functions in other UN agencies. 7.5. Is not a recommendation 7.6 Partly agree. As noted previously, the Evaluation Service currently ringfences funds in its own HQ budget to top-up DEs. It is engaging with Bureaux and Divisions to look at the financing for DEs, and successes have been made in those regions with SREOs for earmarking of, albeit limited, resources for evaluation for 2022. This will be seen as proof of concept to build out from. A formal set-aside or contingency fund is not viable at this point in time for UNHCR, and the evidence from other agencies is mixed in terms of utilization of such funds. Discussions with DSPR, Bureaux and operations in the first full year of MYSP roll-out, and the development of M&E plans, will reveal the numbers of DEs planned, the amount of budget allocated and the gap – and this will provide evidence to guide the process for developing a mechanism over time – whether improving the ringfencing at the relevant operational level; establishing a set-aside or pooled fund, or other.

<i>Unit or function responsible:</i>		<i>Evaluation Service, Senior Management, Regional Bureaux Directors</i>				
<i>Top-line planned actions</i>		<i>By whom</i>	<i>By whom</i>	<i>Expected completion date</i>	<i>Progress</i>	
					<i>Status</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1	<i>Evaluation Strategy 2022-26 addressing both the decentralized and centralized facets of the function to be prepared</i>	ES	<i>The current strategy expires in 2022 and will be updated by Q3, 2022. This will address both the decentralized and centralized facets of the evaluation function – as a system – including, inter alia, roles, governance, norms.</i>	Q3, 2022		
2	<i>Review of the evaluation strategy in 2025</i>	ES	<i>The strategy will be reviewed in its final year, including the decentralized elements. The JIU has indicated it may undertake a UN-wide evaluation of decentralized evaluation functions in the next years.</i>	Q2, 2025		
3	<i>Establish additional regional evaluation posts, with all regions covered by 2025.</i>	RPMB	<i>2 new posts will be established in AP and MENA regions in 2022 and in the Africa and Europe regions by 2025. Changes in reporting lines will be considered based on the 2025 review results.</i>	2025		
4	<i>Invest in evaluation capacity development strategy at regional and country levels.</i>	ES	<i>Community of Practice M&E (w/DSPR), building evaluation content into existing training programmes, work with DSPR and DHR on institutionalize core competencies and skills within the workforce e.g. standard job profiles, etc.</i>	2026		
5	<i>ES will continue its practice of ringfencing some of its budget for support to decentralized evaluations. Regional Bureaus will ensure that regional activity funds are</i>	ES/RBs	<i>Funding for decentralized evaluations can be sourced from different funding pots – from donor funded projects, from OL budgets and/or with contributions from the ES budget. Senior regional evaluation officers to support DEs will need to be part of the ‘core structure’ of the RB and</i>	continuous		

	<i>allocated, amongst other things, for support to DEs in their region,</i>		<i>its budget by 2025 as and when reporting lines change.</i>			
--	---	--	---	--	--	--

RECOMMENDATION 8:		<i>The Panel recommends that the Evaluation Service:</i> <i>8.1) regularly brief interested Member States on findings from key products (from evaluations to syntheses) in informal briefings. The Panel also encourages Member States to engage with the Evaluation Service and to consider how to encourage UNHCR management to adopt learning from evaluations.</i> <i>8.2) submits the next Evaluation Policy for the formal endorsement of the Executive Committee.</i>				
Management response:		Partially agree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):		<i>8.2 Partly agree. UNHCR agrees to brief and consult member states prior to finalization of the next Evaluation Policy. Seeking formal endorsement of the Executive Committee would not be entirely consistent with ExCom's mandate (to advise the High Commissioner on matters relating to his mandate at his request and to review and approve programmes and budgets). Targeted and constructive consultations, at different levels, with member states on UNHCR's strategies are the current practice, rather than submitting these to the Committee for formal endorsement.</i>				
Unit or function responsible:		Evaluation Service, Governance Service				
Top-line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
1	Informal discussion with member states on the draft evaluation policy	DHC and Evaluation Service & ExCom Secretariat		Q1, 2022		
2	An informal MS briefing each year, in addition to the ExCom formal evaluation report presentation each autumn.	Evaluation Service	To be accompanied by a complimentary annual evaluation publication summarizing both key learning and an update on the state of the evaluation function in UNHCR.	Q2, 2022 (and then annual)		

3	<i>Informal briefings on demand from MS on specific strategic evaluations</i>	<i>Evaluation Service</i>	<i>Such briefings may also be bilateral e.g., briefings of the PMs on country strategy evaluations completed in their country.</i>	<i>As needed</i>		
RECOMMENDATION 10:		<i>The Panel recommends that the Evaluation Service considers following up the implementation of agreed evaluation recommendations on the second- and third-year anniversaries, as a way of driving both accountability and learning.</i>				
Management response:		Agree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):		<i>The evaluation service understands the recommendation as referring to two follow ups (+1 and +2 years post report finalization) The ES will review approaches, including the UK's Independent Commission on Aid Impact (ICAI) process of review both of relevance of recommendations after the fact, and the level of implementation, in a more integrated and qualitative review approach, not necessarily for all nor after a fixed period of time.</i>				
Unit or function responsible:		<i>Evaluation Service</i>				
Top-line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
1	<i>Evaluation follow up reporting made a requirement under the updated evaluation policy.</i>	<i>EO/ES/IGO</i>	<i>It will be sensible to adopt the same system tools that are used for internal audit and other oversight recommendations.</i>	<i>Q1, 2022</i>		
2	<i>Establish qualitative follow ups including the assessment of the ongoing relevance of recommendations after a period of time</i>	<i>ES</i>	<i>Could be undertaken with other oversight functions.</i>	<i>Q4, 2022</i>		

