

Management Response Matrix – Final Report Meta-Evaluation of IOM’s Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019)

Evaluation title/year: FINAL REPORT META-EVALUATION OF IOM’S INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS (2017-2019), 2020

Person or entity responsible for completing the management follow-up response matrix:

Diana Cartier, Oversight M&E Officer OIG and Evaluation Manager

Overall comment on evaluation process: IOM accepts the overall findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in the report. Findings from this meta-evaluation are particularly encouraging given the often-limited financial resources allocated to evaluations in IOM. The recommendations of the meta-evaluation will contribute to broader efforts IOM is undertaking to improve the Organisation’s efficiency and effectiveness in programme delivery, its agility and responsiveness.

Recommendation 1: IOM should **update the inception and evaluation report, as well as the ToR templates, and use them under all frameworks and donors.** The use of evaluation templates should remain mandatory for internal evaluators. As for external, it should be mandatory to include all specific sections considered in aforementioned templates. **The following items should be included in inception, evaluation and ToR templates:**

- **A standardized format to draft recommendations** should be added to the relevant section of the evaluation report template. The format presented in this recommendations section could be followed, as it includes the key elements considered toward ensuring the actionability and comprehensiveness of recommendations.
- **Include a specific section on lessons learned and good practices in evaluation report templates,** to ensure these are included in every evaluation report when applicable. Even when not applicable, the information on the lack of lessons learned and good practices would be also relevant to managers and other stakeholders. ILO templates for these items could serve as an inspiration¹.
- Ensure that **all evaluations include an evaluation matrix** as a mandatory deliverable, and that reference is made to the relevant existing template in the IOM Project Handbook.
- Ensure **higher comprehensiveness** by including evaluation costs, duration of the evaluation, a list of tables and figures and an attached inception report in evaluation report templates. ToR templates should include a specific section on norms and standards, specifically request the identification of unintended effects and include management arrangements.
- Use the **meta-evaluation tool designed as a checklist** to ensure that all key aspects (items) are taken into consideration for all kind of evaluations. This will help increase the ratings dramatically in the next global meta-evaluation, as the tool should serve as a basis for the assessment of future evaluation reports.

Recommendation to:

OIG Evaluation as the function responsible for developing evaluation-related policies and

Priority level (1 to 3):

HIGH

¹ https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165981/lang--en/index.htm

Management Response Matrix – Final Report Meta-Evaluation of IOM’s Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019)

guidance whilst working with other stakeholders such as the Regional M&E Officers.				
<p>Management response (Accepts)</p> <p>We accept this recommendation. Part of the suggestions above are on-going in the framework of the development of the new M&E guidelines such as the review of the terms of reference and reports templates. IOM has developed guidance for evaluations that have been systematically shared with staff as they come out. The additional points suggested through the meta-evaluation will be included in further guidance such as providing guidance on the development of recommendations, lessons learnt and good practices. The guidance for terms of reference will also include making the evaluation matrix obligatory (and inception report recommended), the inclusion of lessons learnt, good practices and all cross-cutting themes. Furthermore, additional effort will be made to ensure that evaluators are well aware of the expectations required in evaluations. These will include the ethics code of conduct for evaluators, the quality assurance guidance and checklist and evaluation report template so they can understand the requirements (even if they do not use the template itself) and the need to include cross-cutting themes. Beyond these recommendations, IOM is also assessing how to develop a systematic quality control mechanism in order to assess evaluations on a regular basis.</p>				
Key action	Time frame or deadline	Responsible individual or unit(s)	Implementation monitoring	
			Comments or action taken	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen guidance on TOR to include necessary elements such as evaluation matrix and lessons learnt/good practices within the evaluations - Finalise the quality assurance guidance and checklist and make this available to all evaluation managers and evaluators. - Evaluation report templates to be adjusted in accordance with the quality assurance guidance - Ensure evaluation template guidance should be provided to all evaluators <i>even if they choose to adjust the structure of the report; they should ensure that the content is included.</i> 	<p>On-going</p> <p>Deadline: end of 2020</p>	<p>OIG Evaluation</p> <p>M&E guidelines are being redrafted now and some of these elements will be included there</p> <p>Guidance on quality assurance is on-going</p>	<p>To be completed during review of progress</p>	<p>To be completed during review of progress</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Evaluations would provide meaningful information about cross-cutting issues if gender-responsive actions, RBA and environmental sensitivity would be consistently included in all the phases of the evaluation. This should be considered from the early needs assessments, identification of stakeholders and definition of the evaluation methodology, to the final analysis and interpretation of results and when relevant, as part of the recommendations. In order to ensure that, it is proposed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an additional criterion on cross-cutting issues in the ToR template, as well as in the template for evaluations questions. A link or reference to the template on cross-cutting thematic evaluation questions already included in the IOM Project Handbook should be also made for reference. 				

Management Response Matrix – Final Report Meta-Evaluation of IOM’s Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019)

- Lesson learned and good practices templates should offer ideas and experiences on how to detect and reports cross-cutting themes.

Recommendation to:
OIG Evaluation as the function responsible for developing evaluation-related policies and guidance whilst working with other stakeholders such as the Regional M&E Officers.

Priority level (1 to 3):

MEDIUM

Management response (Accepts)

OIG agrees with this recommendation and acknowledges that elements on cross-cutting issues need to be done in coordination with other departments to ensure that they are properly incorporated and understood. Preliminary discussions are on-going with the relevant responsible departments.

Key action	Time frame or deadline	Responsible individual or unit(s)	Implementation monitoring	
			Comments or action taken	Status
- Lessons learnt and good practice guidance will be developed by OIG as per recommendation 1	4 th Q 2020/1 st Q 2021	OIG Evaluation	To be completed during review of progress	To be completed during review of progress
- Ensure that cross-cutting issues are always included in evaluation TOR templates and in evaluation report templates	End of 2020	OIG Evaluation		
- Provide further guidance for improved integration of cross-cutting thematic questions and how to cover them in the evaluation reports.	2021	OIG Evaluation with respective departments		

Recommendation 3: In order to complement already mentioned institutional efforts made in recent years, the following strategies should be considered toward strengthening the evaluation process:

- Establish a **systematic approach to decide when to conduct internal or external evaluations**. The type and timing of an evaluation could depend on the amount of funding, thematic considerations, the purpose or the duration of the project under consideration, and should be negotiated with the donor. Criteria used by other UN agencies (i.e. UNDP, UNICEF) could be used as a reference.
- Keep promoting evaluative approaches and PPR for **evaluations with reduced budget, and in an overall sense, ensure that evaluations with low budgets focus on very specific areas or information needs**. Complex, multi-country or regional evaluations should ensure a minimum evaluation budget allowing sufficient time for its adequate implementation. Among the strategies to maximize the efficient use of evaluation resources would be to conduct joint thematic evaluations covering similar interventions under same or different donors and combine evaluation budgets.

Management Response Matrix – Final Report Meta-Evaluation of IOM’s Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep implementing evaluation capacity building activities and the coaching initiative, enriching the existing network of internal evaluators and increasing evaluation skills of general staff as stated in the OIG M&E strategy 2018-2020. This will also contribute to develop a strong evaluation culture within the Organization and limit the negative impact of staff turnover. • Establish clear guidelines to homogenize the involvement of ROMEOS in different evaluations (complexity, duration of the project, budget available, etc.), ensuring that their involvement is not only based on a demand-driven approach, but also according to some shared criteria. This is particularly relevant when considering key evaluations for which ROMEOS in-depth involvement should be compulsory. • Keep developing and expanding a comprehensive and shared pool of evaluation experts, both internal and external, including key thematic and geographical expertise, as well as working languages. • Recognizing the role played by internal evaluators. The use of public recognition feeds, peer recognition and rewards could be complemented with other positive reinforcements, such as economic incentives, internal promotions, or allocating staff time to accomplish their evaluative function during key evaluation stages. 	
<p>Recommendation to: OIG Evaluation as the function responsible for developing evaluation-related policies and guidance whilst working with other stakeholders such as the Regional M&E Officers.</p>	<p>Priority level (1 to 3): Varying priority levels as each could be considered a recommendation on its own.</p>
<p>Management response (Accepts) Whilst overall, IOM accepts these recommendations, a few points are necessary to better contextualize the ability to apply them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IOM appreciates the need to identify the possibility of developing a systematic approach to decide when to conduct an internal or external evaluation however notes that this is not always feasible. IOM has seen how other agencies make decisions on the type of evaluation in relation to budget and timeframe however these categorisations are not relevant in the IOM context given the nature of projectisation and the short duration of most projects. Nonetheless, IOM’s project handbook does provide guidance on the various reasons for internal vs. external evaluations and these will be further enhanced within the new M&E Guidelines that OIG is working on this year. Similarly, further guidance could be provided as to how to adjust evaluations based on the budget considerations. 2. OIG Evaluation agrees that the capacity building and coaching initiatives should continue. IOM aims to further systematise coaching processes which remain ad hoc and vary from one coach to the next. Evaluation rosters are also in place including information on the internal and external evaluators 3. The role and responsibility of the Regional M&E Officers (ROMEOS) in the support for the conduct of evaluations is indeed not homogenised and the levels of support may vary based on work load and mechanisms in place within each regional office or from HQ. Given the decentralised nature of evaluations and the decentralised structure at IOM, new instructions for IOM offices may be needed to better determine how ROMEOS will be involved in each evaluation. 4. Role of internal evaluators: we may need to conduct further analysis on the use of internal evaluators and possible rewards or formal recognition. Some internal evaluators, despite their quality and interest may not be authorized to conduct evaluations by their supervisors and affect a fair treatment of all those who participated in the internal evaluator training. Such measures will be discussed with IOM Human 	

Management Response Matrix – Final Report Meta-Evaluation of IOM’s Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019)

Resources and Staff Development to examine how such technical skills can be rewarded or highlighted as competencies, for instance for M&E related jobs.				
Key action	Time frame or deadline	Responsible individual or unit(s)	Implementation monitoring	
			Comments or action taken	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M&E guidelines drafting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Add additional points on budget implications to evaluations and type of evaluators to use - Guidance for decentralised evaluation - Coaching guidance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Develop a simple but systematic approach to coaching new evaluators to support better tracking and integration of performance within future evaluations o Identify options for improving recognition of efforts of internal evaluators at IOM 	<p>On-going – end of 2020</p> <p>2021 End of 2020</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p>OIG with review by ROMEOS</p> <p>OIG/ROMEIO</p> <p>OIG/ROMEIO</p> <p>OIG/HR</p>	<p>To be completed during review of progress</p>	<p>To be completed during review of progress</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: IOM would enhance evaluation dissemination and use by considering the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing access to a systematic classification of evaluation results in the evaluation repository, allowing the identification of key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and good practices by thematic and geographical areas, type of evaluation, etc. would be key to boost internal evaluation use for decision making and programming. • Implementing strategies to ensure the inclusion and participation of the target population in the evaluation process (e.g. include them in ToR, allocate mission time and budget for their participation, engage IOM staff in the inclusiveness of this target group). This could explore the relevance and strategic fit of the intervention outside the sphere of influence of donor/client/implementers, and make evaluations more according to RBA. • Continue raising awareness of the utility and uses of evaluation among staff, as another strategy to build evaluation culture within the Organization. More specifically, efforts should be made to engage management, such as chiefs of mission, regional directors and regional thematic experts. 				
<p>Recommendation to: OIG Evaluation as the function responsible for developing evaluation-related policies and guidance whilst working with other stakeholders such as the Regional M&E Officers.</p>		<p>Priority level (1 to 3): <i>HIGH</i></p>		

Management Response Matrix – Final Report Meta-Evaluation of IOM’s Internal and External Evaluations (2017-2019)

Management response (Accepts)

OIG Evaluation agrees with the recommendations related to evaluation dissemination.

1. The existing evaluation repository (to be also made available for external users in 2020) already provides users with the opportunity to search and find evaluations relevant to their needs and categorises evaluation by type, geographical areas etc. In order to categorise findings, recommendations, lessons learnt or good practices, additional work is required. This is partially feasible through synthesis evaluation which is promoted and can be financed by OIG, and also through improving the mechanism of following the implementation of recommendations. The latter will be adjusted through the PRIMA system, in which the evaluation records are being strengthened. OIG Evaluation is also exploring other avenues such as extracting lessons learnt and good practices that can then be summarised for improved uptake into programme development.
2. Strengthening the inclusion and participation of target population in evaluation process is important and necessary. However full participation as is the case for participatory evaluations may not be feasible for time and budget constraints. OIG will better clarify in its guidelines how participatory approaches can be better applied and at which stage in the evaluation process.
3. Awareness raising on the utility and use of evaluation is central in OIG M&E strategy and initiatives are on-going to continue reinforcing an evaluation culture in IOM and the ROMEOS are actively participating to such initiatives at the regional level. Activities include for instance raising awareness about evaluation through the development of the repository, a growing community of practice and more direct communication with staff worldwide (including the development of a Yammer account). Evaluation has also been fully integrated into the My IOM Platform being developed by the Office of the Director General’s Results-based Management function. In conjunction, OIG is developing a platform that will integrate all aspects of monitoring and evaluation into one location to ease access for IOM staff. OIG will consider assessing how Directors of Departments, Regional Directors and Chiefs of Missions can be more proactive in the use of the benefits of evaluation as an accountability, learning and promotion tool.

Key action	Time frame or deadline	Responsible individual or unit(s)	Implementation monitoring	
			Comments or action taken	Status
- Conduct utilisation-focused synthesis evaluations and studies of lessons learnt and good practices	On-going	OIG in coordination with the relevant teams and departments	To be completed during review of progress	To be completed during review of progress
- Brainstorm and review good practices from other agencies in integration of evaluation findings/recommendations and participatory evaluation practices that could be integrated at IOM	Focus for 2021	OIG		
- Development of the OIG platform that will provide access to information on M&E across the organization	On-going; mid-2021	OIG		
- Increase means of communication to engage with management (RDs, HQ, Directors, COM).	On-going; 2021	OIG – to be discussed during strategic review and development		