



Call for Proposals

Evaluation of EvalPartners'
Strategic Plan 2018 – 2020

February 25, 2020





Evaluation of EvalPartners' Strategic Plan (2018-2020)

Terms of Reference

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Context and Background | 2 |
| 2. Purpose of the Evaluation | 4 |
| 2.1 Rationale and Objectives | 4 |
| 2.2 Stakeholders and Users | 5 |
| 3. Evaluation scope, questions, proposed approach and methodology | 5 |
| 3.1 Scope | 5 |
| 3.2 Evaluation questions | 5 |
| 3.3 Proposed approach and methodology | 6 |
| 4. Governance and Management | 7 |
| 4.1. Roles and Responsibilities | 7 |
| 4.2. Evaluation team composition | 8 |
| 4.3. Timeline and deliverables | 8 |
| 5. Application process and requirements | 9 |
| | |
| Annex I: EvalPartners stocktaking exercise | 11 |
| Annex II: Preliminary stakeholders' analysis of EvalPartners | 16 |
| Annex III: Evaluation Reference Group | 17 |
| Annex IV: Evaluation detailed timeline | 18 |



1. Context and Background

1. **EvalPartners** is a global movement that shapes the international agenda for evaluation by encouraging the evaluation profession to take a more global approach in addressing world problems and creating a platform for evaluation capacity development. EvalPartners harnessed the global advocacy and outreach efforts to build evaluation capacity at national level. It culminated in declaring 2015 “**International Year for Evaluation**” (EvalYear’2015) by a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. During EvalYear 2015, 100+ events were held worldwide to promote evaluation and contribute to the development of a “Global Evaluation Agenda 2016 – 2020” (EvalAgenda’2020).
2. In the context of the Sustainable Development Agenda 2030, the **EvalAgenda 2020** sets the vision for evaluation to inform decision-making, be an integral part of all efforts by governments, civil society, and the private sector to improve the lives and conditions of all citizens and become embedded in good governance while amplifying the voice of the disadvantaged and marginalized. EvalAgenda 2020 comprises **four essential dimensions/ strategic focus areas** of the evaluation system:
 - i. the **enabling environment** for evaluation;
 - ii. **institutional capacities**;
 - iii. **individual capacities** for evaluation, and
 - iv. **inter-linkages** among these first three dimensions.
3. To that end, the EvalAgenda 2020 provided a road map towards the vision for the future of evaluation profession jointly developed by thousands of evaluators from different countries and organizations. EvalAgenda 2020 is of paramount importance within the context of the Sustainable Development Agenda 2030. The Agenda recognizes that **evaluation often makes major contributions to government and communities** and that it largely works behind the scenes and consequently its potential for major impact is under-recognized.
4. EvalPartners actively works to implement the EvalAgenda 2020 with various stakeholders including **Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs)** through the **International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE)**; with the United Nations and other stakeholders through a series of **EvalPartners networks** and other initiatives. In an attempt to reach out to the non-traditional players and reinforce the efforts of the evaluation community, a **revised governance structure for EvalPartners** was drafted to account for **three colleges** of partners within EvalPartners, namely the **VOPEs, UN** and **other partners’ colleges**. The new structure was endorsed in July 2019 calling for key partners to join efforts with the VOPEs and the UN colleges to promote country-led evaluation of the 2030 Agenda.



5. The **EvalPartners Strategic Plan 2018-2020** sets out four specific outcome level objectives:
 - Improved capacity to evaluate the SDGs;
 - Professional development of evaluators;
 - Raising the profile of evaluation amongst a wide range of stakeholders;
 - Consolidation of the ongoing work and initiatives of the five EvalPartners networks

6. The work of **five core EvalPartners' networks** operationalizes EvalPartners' contribution towards the EvalAgenda 2020. Each of the networks brings together hundreds of evaluation professionals from around the globe:
 - i. to discuss thematic related to adding value and learning to the SDGs through evaluation (**EVALS**SDGs);
 - ii. empowering and capacitating Young and Emerging Evaluators (**EvalYouth**);
 - iii. enshrining gender and equity dimensions in evaluation (**EvalGender+**);
 - iv. valuing the strength of indigenous evaluation practices (**EvalIndigenous**); and
 - v. the **Global Parliamentarian Forum on Evaluation** which works to establish parliaments and parliamentarians as key evaluation stakeholders.

7. Decision-makers often do not sufficiently rely on the evidence that evaluations generate to assist in making better, more inclusive decisions. For this reason, EvalPartners, at the **Third Global Forum for Evaluation** in Bishkek during April 2017 identified two Flagship Programs to drive forward the EvalAgenda2020 as shown below:
 - **Flagship Program 1: Strengthen national capacity for country-led evaluation systems**, to will provide support to at least 15 countries to strengthen national evaluation capacities;
 - **Flagship Program 2: "Evidence Matters" for SDGs and beyond**, aiming to raise the evaluation practice for the SDGs and beyond by advocating for evidence-based policymaking amongst a wide range of stakeholders.

8. The Flagship Programs will strengthen existing EvalPartners networks to add value to their activities as well as lead to new and innovative initiatives, particularly to ensure that the progress towards the SDGs is reviewed and accelerated through national evaluation systems. The Flagship Programs constitute the core of EvalPartners programming funded by the **Swiss Development Corporation** (SDC). They were designed and implemented to complement each other, building on the Evaluation Agenda 2020.

In addition, EvalPartners has launched its **Peer-to-Peer program - Strengthening the Role of VOPEs in Democratizing Learning and Evaluation: Democracy, Human Rights and Labor as a Showcase**, a project supported by the U.S. Department of State. The project targets Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs) to apply through an open call for and practicing evaluators in order to contribute to the objectives of: (1) documenting local solutions, (2) democratizing learning and evaluation, and (3) making evaluation a mainstreamed and necessary



part of any decision-making process. The project has four key activities to be accomplished in the project period:

- **Peer-to-Peer grants** aiming at supporting partnership-based to six North-South or South-South partnerships;
- **Innovation Challenge grants** for four projects developed jointly by at least two VOPEs. In the 2016-17 cycle, a total of 33 applications were received involving 63 VOPEs from all over the Globe to pilot most viable innovations;
- Development of E-learning module on DRG;
- Development of a section on DRG in the VOPE Toolkit.

9. **Innovation Challenge program** focuses on innovative approaches to strengthening the enabling environment for evaluation. In practice, this is translated into three types of projects:

- Creating coalitions of evaluation champions on the demand-side: Creating push-type peer-pressure on decision-makers:
- Creating pull-type peer-pressure on decision-makers.
- The theme of the 2017 Innovation Challenge round was involving Non-Traditional Evaluation Partners in EvalAgenda 2020 and 21 application were received.

10. In 2018, EvalPartners completed a **stocktaking exercise of EvalPartners Accomplishments 2015-2017** to i) assist EvalPartners in its future planning, with better information about benefits and outcomes arising from its activities; ii) aid EvalPartners in its reporting of results to the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and iii) provide ideas about possible considerations that might be explored in the 2020 evaluation. Annex I presents the Executive Summary of the stocktaking exercise, corresponding recommendations and management response.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

2.1 Rationale and Objectives

11. The evaluation of EvalPartners' Strategic Plan (2018-2020) will be conducted by EvalPartners in 2020. The evaluation will serve the **dual objectives** of accountability and learning:

- **Accountability:** the evaluation responds to demand for accountability and evidence of EvalPartners by its assessing performance:
- **Learning** from experience, by discovering how EvalPartners activities and programs have worked or not, and to improve understanding of why they have proven relatively successful or unsuccessful in particular contexts.

12. The main **purpose** of the evaluation is to inform the development of future EvalPartners' Strategic Plan (2021-2023) and feed into the preparation of the new EvalAgenda (2020-2025).



2.2 Stakeholders and Users

13. The evaluation will seek the views of, and be useful to, a range of EvalPartners' stakeholders. The primary users of the evaluation are EvalPartners members and stakeholders, including networks and VOPEs to inform and feed into their interventions at the global, regional and national levels.
14. Other potential global stakeholders and users of the evaluation will include the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) members, key partners and donors. Annex II presents a preliminary list of stakeholders. The inception report will include a more in-depth stakeholder analysis prepared the evaluation team, to further deepen the stakeholder analysis through the use of appropriate tools, such as gender-sensitive accountability maps, power-to-influence or stakeholder matrices.

3. Evaluation scope, questions, proposed approach and methodology

3.1 Scope

The evaluation will examine **EvalPartners Strategic Plan** during the period 2018-2020 and will capture the evolving context to which EvalPartners has responded. It is expected that the evaluation builds on the results of the 2018 stocktaking exercise.

3.2 Evaluation questions

15. This evaluation address the four main questions listed below.

EQ1: Relevance: *To what extent are the objectives of EvalPartners' Strategic Plan and the four strategic focus areas envisaged in the EvalAgenda 2020 consistent with the EvalPartners priorities, countries needs and partners' policies and practice?*

- 1) What **role** has EvalPartners played in the international evaluation landscape?
- 2) To what extent are the four strategic focus areas envisaged in the **EvalAgenda 2020** still relevant?

EQ2: Effectiveness: *To what extent have the four outcome level objectives identified in the Strategic Plan (2018-2020) been achieved, and specific outputs led (or are expected to lead) to achievement of expected outcomes as planned.*

- 1) To what extent has **progress** been made in the implementation of EvalPartners Strategic Plan 2018-2020?
- 2) What are the main achievements of the initiatives undertaken through the **five EvalPartners networks**, the two **Flagship programs**, the **Peer-to-Peer (P2P) grant programmes**, the **Innovation Challenge small grant programs**?
- 3) To what extent have these initiatives been **coherent and connected to contribute** towards achievement of EvalAgenda 2020?



EQ3: Efficiency: *To what extent has EvalPartners made best use of available resources (funds, expertise, time etc.)?*

- 1) To what extent has EvalPartners been efficient in the **use of the resources** including **expertise and time** provided by the membership of EvalPartners and **funding** from development partners and donors?
- 2) To what extent have EvalPartners' activities been **implemented** in an efficient and timely manner?
- 3) What lessons are emerging from the implementation of the revised EvalPartners **governance structure**?

EQ4: Sustainability: *What is the likely continuation of the short- and long-term benefits from EvalPartners' activities?*

- 1) How are EvalPartners activities and programme contributing to sustainable action to build evaluation capacities at national, regional and global levels?
- 2) How has **learning** from the various programmes and activities been shared and disseminated?
- 3) To what extent has EvalPartners expanded **partnership arrangements and funding base**?

3.3 Proposed approach and methodology

16. Given the philosophy, values and approach of EvalPartners, it is expected that a highly **participatory and mixed method (qualitative and quantitative) approach** would be used throughout the different evaluation phases.
17. **Data collection and analysis:** A fully-fledged evaluation methodology will be developed and refined at the inception stage. Field work (evaluation missions) is not envisaged at the time of writing the TOR, interviews and focus groups are expected to be conducted by telephone/video conferencing). The evaluation will draw on a number of data collection tools, including, but not limited to:
 - **Desk review** of all relevant documents and material, including progress reports towards EvalPartners strategic plan 2018-2020, programmes and activities' progress reports, donors' and financial reports, in addition to the knowledge management and dissemination materials produced;
 - **Survey** of relevant stakeholders.
 - **Semi-structured interviews** with relevant stakeholders.
 - **Focus group** discussion with EvalPartners Networks, committees and task forces.
18. **Validation:** Information collected from various sources and methods will be triangulated.
19. **Stakeholder engagement:** The evaluation will engage all relevant EvalPartners stakeholders, including: Executive Committee and Coordination Committee, IOCE Board, UN Agencies,



EvalPartners Advisory Committee, leaders of the Networks, representatives of donor agencies, representatives of regional and national VOPEs, policy makers, government and civil society representatives in the countries of interventions. The draft evaluation report, including findings, conclusions and recommendations, will be presented at the **Global Evaluation Forum** planned to take place in Mexico, during the second week of November 2020.

20. The evaluation is expected to draw from a broad and diverse body of information, evaluative evidence, primary and secondary data. Main secondary data sources include: EP Strategic Plan (2018-2020), EvalAgenda 2020, EP Stocktaking Report, the Funders proposals and reports, the Flagship Program 1 concept, related country-specific project reports (available on google drive), Flagship Program 2 concept and all related initiatives, the P2P and Innovation Challenge documents including the project proposals and final reports, the Networks knowledge production and initiatives (mostly uploaded on the networks' websites: EvalSDGs, EvalYouth, EvalGender+, EvalIndigenous and GPFE).

4. Governance and Management

4.1. Roles and Responsibilities

21. This evaluation will be jointly managed by the **Evaluation and Knowledge Management Committee**, from which one member will be nominated as the lead evaluation manager. Responsibilities of the Evaluation and Knowledge Management Committee include to: finalise the evaluation TOR; provide quality assurance; set up the Evaluation Reference Group.
22. The nominated **evaluation manager** will be the main contact point for the evaluation team. S/he will be responsible for the overall evaluation process; organizing the learning workshop; soliciting feedback on the draft report.
23. The **Evaluation Reference Group** (ERG) composed of representatives from across EvalPartners networks and governance structure will contribute to the review of both inception and evaluation report and validation of evaluation findings.
24. The evaluation will be conducted by an **evaluation team** who will directly report the nominated evaluation manager and the Evaluation and Knowledge Management Committee and will be responsible for completing all the deliverables of this exercise as specified below:
- Prepare the **Inception Report**, including the evaluation approach/methodology, framework (theory of change), evaluation matrix and tools, identified informants, data collection tools and plan;
 - **Undertake data collection activities and analyse data collected**, indicating for each element the method of data collection, EvalPartners activities to be covered, sources of information, timeframe, interview and survey questions, format of the expected output / format of reports form data collection activities;
 - **Prepare first draft report** of good quality that covers all the minimum requirements



provided in the Terms of Reference, further expanded and agreed in Inception Report. The report should also respond to the key evaluation question with empirical evidence and provide an assessment of the solidarity of information. The report will be shared with Evaluation Reference Group, Evaluation and Knowledge Management Committee, ExComm for comment;

- **Revise the draft report** as per consultations specified in Annex V (detailed timeline)
- **Present the draft report** at the 2020 Global Evaluation in November 2020;
- **Prepare final report** with all comments addressed and meeting evaluation quality standards, which are expected to be systematically applied throughout the evaluation process.

25. The **Executive Management Committee (ExComm)** will be responsible for drafting the management response and leading follow up on the evaluation recommendations.

4.2. Evaluation team composition

26. The **evaluation team** will be composed of 1 Senior and 1 Junior evaluator:

- **Senior Evaluator** - with at least 10 years of relevant experience in evaluation, with a proven track-record in conducting evaluations of complex programmes, implemented in various regions of the world. S/he will be responsible for all aspects of conducting the evaluation. Demonstrated experience in reviewing/evaluating evaluation functions and/or international networks such as EvalPartners would be desirable.
- **Junior Evaluator** – between two to five years of experience in evaluation, research, data analysis and/or project management, with excellent qualitative and quantitative analytical skills and demonstrated ability to manage data, analyze and communicate them.

4.3. Timeline and deliverables

27. The final report is expected not to exceed 50 pages, or 17,000 words, excluding Annexes.

28. The evaluation report along with the management response to the recommendations will be presented will be posted on the public EvalPartners website and disseminated through relevant channels.

29. The estimated duration of work is up to **60 working days**.

Table 1: Proposed timeline summary of key evaluation deliverables

| Phase | 2020 | | | | | 2020/21 | | Deliverables |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|---------|-----------|--|---|
| | Feb-March | Apr-May | Jun-July | Aug-Sep | Oct-Nov | Dec-- Jan | | |
| Preparation | | | | | | | | |
| TOR preparation | X | | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •TOR •Evaluation governance arrangements |
| Stockholders consultation | X | | | | | | | |
| Sen. Evaluator recruitment | X | | | | | | | |
| Inception | | | | | | | | |
| Document review | | X | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception report |
| Quality assurance & ERG review | | X | | | | | | |
| Inception report preparation | | X | | | | | | |
| Data collection | | | | | | | | |
| Data collection | | | X | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Debriefing presentation |
| Debriefing | | | X | | | | | |
| Reporting | | | | | | | | |
| Draft report preparation | | | | X | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Stakeholder workshop •Evaluation report |
| Quality assurance & ERG review | | | | X | | | | |
| Revised report preparation | | | | | X | | | |
| Draft report presentation | | | | | X | | | |
| Report finalization | | | | | | X | | |

5. Application process and requirements

30. The work may be undertaken by one or more individuals (ideally 1 Senior evaluator and 1 junior evaluator) against the schedule of the deliverables listed in table 1 to conduct the evaluation of the EvalPartners Strategic Plan 2018-2020.

31. The evaluation team will be independent with no involvement in past or current EvalPartners activities to ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

32. Interested parties should submit an application consisting of:

- Technical proposal outlining proposed approach and methodology (maximum 10 pages);
- CV(s) of consultant(s) and list of relevant evaluations or reviews conducted within the last 3 years;
- Financial proposal (detailed budget specifying daily fee and estimated number of days, travel expenses and other additional costs);
- Tentative workplan with working days for main activities and dates for milestones and deliverables (e.g. using a Gantt chart);
- Applications/ proposals should be submitted to Lynn Burgess - Lynn@ioce.net no later than Wednesday March 18, 2020.



- Winners will be notified on April 1, 2020 should be able to start immediately.
- For any questions or further information regarding the evaluation, please contact Lynn Burgess - Lynn@ioce.net.

6. Contract and Financial Provisions

33. The total amount budgeted for the evaluation will be inclusive of the consultancy fees and all expenses incurred for travel and accommodation associated with the evaluation and taxes.
34. The contract is expected to be up to 60 working days over a 10-month period.



Annex I: EvalPartners stocktaking exercise

Executive Summary

Background and purpose of this EvalPartners stocktaking exercise

EvalPartners (EP) is a global voluntary movement of evaluators formed in 2012, with the aim of establishing evaluation around the world as an essential management and social change instrument and an objective of advocating for and contributing to change to the (Eval)world. EP commissioned a first comprehensive formative evaluation of its activities in 2014 and is planning another evaluation in 2019.

EP commissioned this stocktaking of its activities between 2015-2017 with the following purposes:

- To assist EvalPartners in its future planning, with better information about benefits and outcomes arising from its activities.
- To aid EvalPartners in its reporting of results to the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- To provide ideas about possible considerations that might be explored in the proposed 2019 evaluation.

While this stocktaking exercise also considered EP's management practices and programming strategy, its priority was to identify, to the extent possible, results (including outcomes, accomplishments and influence) following from what EP has done. The stocktaking considered EP's three main levels of operating:

- The global level.
- EvalPartners five networks.
- Peer-to-peer and Innovation Challenge projects funded by EP.

Data-gathering approaches, in addition to document review, interviews, email queries and some other methods, featured seven case studies across all three levels in order to get a better idea of emerging or actual outcomes arising from EP. As a stocktaking exercise rather than a full evaluation, with limited resources and barely 3 months in total to undertake, there are significant limitations to the ability of this exercise to explore all possible considerations in depth.

Key findings

Following are what we view as the three key findings of this stocktaking exercise:

- EP activities at all levels (global, networks, and projects) have contributed to an impressive array of outcomes, accomplishments and influence.
- EP partnership model has been identified as part of its DNA and represents its core strength. At the same time, we have highlighted the need for EP to do more to strengthen its partnerships,



particularly with the UN, where the failure of the UN to nominate a co-chair since the beginning of 2017 needs to be addressed, otherwise the future of EP may well be fragile.

EP organisation and functioning, considering its short lifespan and its voluntary nature, in general has been noteworthy, although we identify some areas that might benefit from some additional attention. We note that the EP governance structure has been evolving, which we view as a positive sign of responsiveness and flexibility.

Recommendations

To the EvalPartners Management Group (EPMG)

- EP volunteers and partners should take time to celebrate EP's many accomplishments since it was founded some five years ago, recognising what a group of dedicated volunteers can bring about. EP should give some reflection to how this energy and engagement can be sustained.
- As a matter of priority, the EPMG and its Executive Committee should be proactive in (re)engaging with current and potential new partners, with priority to the UN. We consider the need for such action the most important finding arising from this stocktaking exercise.
- EP, while acknowledging its success in raising funds to support its current activities, should begin to explore future funding options so that its focus does not need to shift from implementation of activities when the current cycle of funding terminates.
- Consider ways of maximising the value of projects, for example:
 - Engage with projects at a mid-point, to provide encouragement and support to project volunteers and to get a better understanding of expected progress.
 - Consider webinars showcasing accomplishments of projects, as well as to increase awareness among EPMG members about what projects are doing.
 - Explore ways of extracting, and sharing, key findings, themes, and learnings from projects. These should inform future requests for proposals for projects so that learnings about what has worked well, or not, can be taken into consideration in future projects.
 - Identify ways of enhancing the way project information is currently stored, tracked, and could be made more accessible, to facilitate easier access to information about projects.
- Given their encouraging start, keep an eye on the networks, sharing experiences and accomplishments as well as learnings that might be of value to others, and as need be how any necessary support could be provided, including increased links across networks.
- Explore reasons for an apparent lack of consensus or uncertainty among EPMG members on many of the items of the self-assessment questionnaire regarding management practices, and as need be take steps to build a better and shared understanding.
- Examine EP's strategic vision, including the need for refinements, as well as ideas about moving beyond Agenda 2020.



For the planned 2019 evaluation

It is beyond the scope of this stocktaking exercise to do more than to provide some initial ideas that the forthcoming EP evaluation might explore in more depth.

- Examine how effective EP has been in engaging and expanding its partnership arrangements, such as recommended in this stocktaking report.
- Take an in-depth look at the networks, in particular to identify outcomes and accomplishments arising from their activities and outputs, but potentially also considering the extent of coordination and cross fertilisation among the networks and with other partners, as well as consistency with EvalAgenda2020 and EPMG’s strategic priorities.
- Undertake a more in-depth study of outcomes arising from a broader range of projects than was possible in this stocktaking exercise, as well as identifying how EP engages and supports the projects it funds and how learnings from projects are shared and disseminated.
- Examine how well the EPMG revised governance structure has been implemented.
- Review progress towards the EvalAgenda2020, as well as implications for future strategic directions.

Draft Management Response to the EvalPartners stocktaking exercise 2015 – 2017

| Recommendation | Proposed Action | Comments/ suggestions | Time frame |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| EP volunteers and partners should take time to celebrate EP’s many accomplishments since it was founded some five years ago, recognising what a group of dedicated volunteers can bring about. EP should give some reflection to how this energy and engagement can be sustained. | To be operationalized under Flagship 2 | Effort to be prepared (receive and read documents ahead); | Proposal to the EPMG by November 2018 |
| As a matter of priority, the EPMG and its Executive Committee should be proactive in (re)engaging with current and potential new partners, with priority to the UN. We consider the need for such action the most important finding arising from this stocktaking. | Currently on high fire, but is a function of other exogenous factors beyond the strict control of EP | – UN Co-Chair is on Board (WFP); Develop a mapping analysis of existing and potential partners (to see who are the potential and how to engage with them); | December 2018 (Inshallah) |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do we engage new partners? - Serge & Dorothy to work on this | |
| <p>EP, while acknowledging its success in raising funds to support its current activities, should begin to explore future funding options so that its focus does not need to shift from implementation of activities when the current cycle of funding terminates.</p> | <p>Should be a high priority on the agenda of the Executive Committee after the new Governance structure is finalized</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A proposal for USDS wasn't successful, for tomorrow meeting | <p>During 2019 after new ExCom is in place</p> |
| <p>Consider ways of maximising the value of projects, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engage with projects at a mid-point, to provide encouragement and support to project volunteers and to get a better understanding of expected progress. - Consider webinars showcasing accomplishments of projects, as well as to increase awareness among EPMG members about what projects are doing. - Explore ways of extracting, and sharing, key findings, themes, and learnings from projects. These should inform future RfPs for projects so that learnings about what has worked well or not, can be taken into consideration in future projects. - Identify ways of enhancing the way project information is currently stored, tracked, and could be made more accessible, to facilitate easier access to information about projects. | <p>An "Evaluation and Knowledge Management Committee" has been established as part of the new governance structure to look after these aspects.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue with more action-oriented follow-up from knowledge management committee? - Review the proposal's criteria (eg. Having certain quality up to a specific standard); - Need a close monitoring and feedback mechanism; | <p>Rest of 2018 into 2019</p> |
| <p>Given their encouraging start, keep an eye on the networks, sharing experiences and accomplishments as well as learnings that might be of value to others, and as need be how any necessary support could be</p> | <p>A "Coordination Committee" was established as part of the new governance structure.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be raised later and completed tomorrow | <p>Rest of 2018 into 2019</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| <p>provided, including increased links across networks.</p> | <p>The e-learning programme was made as a cross-cutting activity (similar to Flagships)</p> | | |
| <p>Explore reasons for an apparent lack of consensus or uncertainty among EPMG members on many of the items of the self-assessment questionnaire regarding management practices, and as need be take steps to build a better and shared understanding.</p> | <p>This could be one of the very first tasks of the “Evaluation and Knowledge Management Committee”.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have an opened collaboration and inclusive consensus in decision-making process including accountability, transparency and participation; - Consider the diversity of views; - Anonymous collection of individual concerns; | <p>Rest of 2018 into 2019</p> |
| <p>Examine EP’s strategic vision, including the need for refinements, as well as ideas about moving beyond Agenda 2020.</p> | <p>This will be entrusted to the new ExCom following the completion of new Governance structure</p> | <p>To be discussed tomorrow</p> | <p>2019</p> |



Annex II: Preliminary stakeholders’ analysis

This is the preliminary list/ category of stakeholders that the Evaluation team should consider consulting with them.

| | |
|---|---|
| EvalPartners Leadership | The Executive Committee, the Coordination Team, IOCE Board, EvalPartners Advisory Committee |
| EvalPartners Networks and Taskforces | Chairs and vice-chairs of the Networks <u>EvalSDGs</u> , <u>EvalYouth</u> , <u>EvalGender+</u> , <u>EvalIndigenous</u> and <u>GPFE</u>) (current and former) The Flagship Program Coordinator, The P2P and Innovation Challenge Coordinator |
| UN Agencies | UNEG, UNICEF, UNWomen, UNFPA and WFP (who make part of the partnership) Other UN Agencies: UNDP, UNDESA |
| Key Partners and Funders | SDC, Rockefeller Foundation, USAID, Government of Finland, World Bank, African Development Bank – potentially to include 2 representatives from Finland and SDC |
| Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs) | A sample of VOPEs (database available) including regional and national associations American Evaluation association (AEA), Canadian Evaluation Society (CES), European Evaluation Society (EES), IDEAS, AfrEA, IOCE |
| Other international evaluation actors | OECD-DAC |
| Governments | National gov't officials in countries with active VOPEs |
| Parliamentarians | Parliamentarians in countries with active forums (Sri Lanka, Kyrgyzstan, etc...) |

Annex III: Evaluation Reference Group

| Network/Program/Constituency | Nominated member |
|---|-------------------------|
| EP ExCom | 1 person tbc |
| EvalSDGs | 1 person tbc |
| EvalYouth | 1 person tbc |
| EvalGender+ | 1 person tbc |
| EvalIndigenous | 1 person tbc |
| Global Parliamentarian Forum for Evaluation | 1 person tbc |
| Flagship Program | Kassem El Saddik |
| P2P/ Innovation Challenge | Asela Kalugampitiya |
| Key partner | 1 person tbc |
| Funding partner | 1 person tbc |

Annex IV: Evaluation detailed timeline

| Phase | 2020 | | | | | 2020/21 | Deliverables |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|---------|-----------|---|
| | Feb-March | Apr-May | Jun-July | Aug-Sep | Oct-Nov | Dec-- Jan | |
| Preparation | | | | | | | |
| TOR preparation | X | | | | | | •TOR •Evaluation governance arrangements |
| Stockholders consultation | X | | | | | | |
| Sen. Evaluator recruitment | X | | | | | | |
| Inception | | | | | | | |
| Document review | | X | | | | | • Inception report |
| Quality assurance & ERG review | | X | | | | | |
| Inception report preparation | | X | | | | | |
| Data collection | | | | | | | |
| Data collection | | | X | | | | •Debriefing presentation |
| Debriefing | | | X | | | | |
| Reporting | | | | | | | |
| Draft report preparation | | | | X | | | •Stakeholder workshop •Evaluation report |
| Quality assurance & ERG review | | | | X | | | |
| Revised report preparation | | | | | X | | |
| Draft report presentation | | | | | X | | |
| Report finalization | | | | | | X | |