Governing Body

346th Session, Geneva, October–November 2022

Programme, Financial and Administrative Section

Audit and Oversight Segment

PFA

Date: 12 September 2022
Original: English

Eighth item on the agenda

Summary of findings on the independent evaluation of the ILO's evaluation function

Purpose of the document

This document provides the Governing Body with a summary of findings on the independent evaluation of the ILO's evaluation function covering the period 2017–21. The Governing Body is invited to endorse the recommendations in this report (see the draft decision in paragraph 45).

Relevant strategic objective: Relevant to all strategic objectives.

Main relevant outcome: Enabling Outcome B: Effective and efficient governance of the Organization.

Policy implications: Yes. Work across the policy outcomes on issues relevant to decent work and productivity.

Legal implications: None.

Financial implications: Changes in resource allocations within approved budget level of the ILO may be required.

Follow-up action required: Yes.

Author unit: Not applicable.

Related documents: GB.331/PFA/8; GB.346/PFA/6; GB.346/PFA/9.

▶ Introduction

1. This independent evaluation of the evaluation function (IEE) fulfils a decision to provide an independent assessment of the ILO's evaluation function every five years. It reviews the role that the evaluation function plays in supporting the ILO's requirements for accountability and organizational learning and informs the next update of the 2022–25 Evaluation Strategy.

2. Specifically, the scope of the IEE is the "evaluation function" which includes:

    - the 2017 evaluation policy;

    - the 2018–21 Evaluation Strategy (extended until 2022);

    - the centralized evaluation function, including the ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL); the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) and the systems, structures, and evaluations within EVAL's remit (for example, quality assurance, knowledge management, communications, etc.);

    - the decentralized evaluation function that includes evaluations of programmes and projects, regional evaluation officers, departmental evaluation focal points, and certified evaluation managers.

3. The evaluation focuses on six interrelated key questions, aligned with the criteria used by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC):

    - Impact: To what extent does the evaluation function help the ILO to deliver against its current strategy?

    - Effectiveness: What is the effectiveness of the evaluation function during the strategic period?

    - Efficiency and sustainability: How efficient, sustainable, and fit-for-purpose are the current arrangements and structures of the evaluation function?

    - Relevance: To what extent does the evaluation function respond to international, organizational, and tripartite policies, interests and information needs?

    - Adaptability: To what extent is the evaluation function able to respond and be adjusted to emerging priorities and stressors?

    - Coherence: To what extent does the evaluation function align with other accountability and learning processes?

4. The evaluation recognizes the significant strengths and credibility of the ILO's current evaluation function and makes recommendations on how to strengthen the evaluation function in relation to its independence, credibility, utility, operational framework, evaluation architecture, and the enabling environment in which it operates.

Methodology

5. The IEE was guided by three principles: rigour (a robust methodological approach), usefulness (a participatory and appraisal-type approach geared to utilization), and quality (adherence to ethical standards and international evaluation norms).

6. The methodology applied mixed methods to triangulate across multiple lines of evidence which included:

- a review of 238 documents and quantitative analysis of datasets pertaining to evaluations and quality assurance, development cooperation and financial expenditure;

- interviews and focus group discussions with 116 key informants;

- surveys of: (i) ILO staff; (ii) ILO senior managers; (iii) evaluation managers, regional evaluation officers, departmental evaluation focal points; and (iv) former and current Governing Body members and non-Governing Body constituents;

- portfolio reviews of a selection of 20 evaluations and three "deep dives".

7. A range of triangulation methods was applied, including the use of a qualitative analytical software programme.

Background

8. All aspects of evaluation in the ILO are guided by the ILO evaluation policy and the ILO evaluation strategy, which adhere to the OECD/DAC Criteria (OECD/DAC 2019) and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) *Norms and Standards for Evaluation* (UNEG, 2016).

9. The 2018–21 Evaluation Strategy (extended until 2022) responded to the findings of the previous 2016 IEE and took a comprehensive approach to bolstering the evaluation function through three main strategic outcomes underpinned by Theory of Change which posits key assumptions about the role of the enabling environment and evaluation culture. The evaluation function produces centralized and decentralized evaluations. Centralized evaluations, which are at the governance level, comprise Decent Work Country Programme evaluations, high-level evaluations, and thematic evaluations where there is a specific request. The ILO conducted a total of 429 evaluations during the period 2017–21, including: 349 project evaluations, of which 64 were projects over $US5 million, 30 cluster evaluations, six thematic evaluations, 20 Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA)-funded activity evaluations, six DWCP internal reviews, five DWCP high-level subregional evaluations and ten high-level policy and institutional evaluations) The largest share (81 per cent) of the ILO's evaluations are decentralized project evaluations, with independent project evaluations accounting for 53 per cent of the total number. Eighteen synthesis reviews and four meta studies were also undertaken. The highest number of evaluations were carried out in Asia and the Pacific and Africa, with 123 and 120 reports respectively.

Overall findings

10. **Impact:** Evaluation is helping the ILO to shape its strategies and operations but is constrained by the prevailing operating environment – including financial and staffing resources, limited time frames and the high number of evaluations being conducted. There is scope for better use of evaluative evidence to drive strategic decision-making that could also meet the demands of constituents, staff and partners for more evaluative evidence and learning on the ILO's impact.

11. **Effectiveness:** The evaluation function has achieved or partially achieved 95 per cent of the sub-outcomes set out in the evaluation strategy. Limited resources and inconsistent engagement in evaluation from across the Organization constrains the full achievement of targets. EVAL excels at producing regular, timely and data-rich reporting on evaluation performance, evaluations undertaken, findings and recommendations, which is highly valued

both internally and externally. The current portfolio of evaluations is dominated by project evaluations. This volume inevitably makes demands on the entire evaluation function in terms of management and quality assurance, and more widely on the ILO in absorbing and using the evidence generated.

12. **Efficiency and sustainability:** The ILO's structural arrangements give weight to the evaluation function and mainstream evaluation across the Organization and across regions. However, the efficiency, sustainability and adequacy of the evaluation structure are threatened by limited investment, organizational incentives and buy-in to evaluation as a source of knowledge and learning. Decentralized evaluations are valued by stakeholders, but the workload on the network, especially the regional evaluation officers, is unsustainable. While there is an increase in and high demand for cluster evaluations, there is a need to optimize their use further. Developing an agreed pipeline of cluster evaluations could improve efficiency.

13. **Relevance:** The ILO's evaluation function is meeting the expected norms and standards for credibility, quality and independence but has not yet fully realized expectations as regards its utility. EVAL is an active and valued member of the United Nations evaluation community, although there is scope for more joint evaluations and harmonized working. The ILO would benefit from a clearer-cut strategy, including in the choices of what to evaluate, to meet the varied tripartite evidence needs and harness their interest in evaluation evidence. Better ways to involve constituents and beneficiaries should be explored so as to benefit from their insights. Evaluations have enhanced efforts to give greater attention to gender and disability, but full integration relies on greater sensitivity to gender, disability, environmental sustainability, and other cross-cutting issues at the project design stage.

14. **Adaptability:** The evaluation strategy provides a clear strategic vision and outcome areas that have potential to support a transformative approach. The policy guidelines provide a consistent, but less nimble, approach to evaluation coverage and prioritization. Guidance developed by EVAL helped the ILO evaluate the effectiveness of its response to the pandemic in the face of significant challenges for delivery, monitoring and evaluation of planned programmes. The Theory of Change set out in the evaluation strategy does not show clear pathways to a stronger evaluative culture or ways to maximize the impact of evaluative evidence.

15. **Coherence:** Evaluations broadly meet the accountability and information requirements of key stakeholders but struggle to tell the story of the ILO's specific unique contributions to change and to impact. Meta-analyses and synthesis reviews enable links to be made across multiple sources of evidence and lessons to be drawn from complementary efforts. The evaluation function needs to move beyond the solid foundation it has built on accountability to embrace the unique learning and improvement potential that evaluation can bring for the ILO.

16. The deep dives yielded several additional insights.

17. **Evaluation culture:** The quality, professionalism and independence of evaluation is well-recognized and endorsed by ILO staff and stakeholders. There is an overall trust in the integrity and credibility of the evaluation process and products. There is a strong appetite in the ILO to use evaluations to assess impact and a shared commitment to compliance with evaluation responsibilities. The evaluation function benefits from a structure that embeds senior management and leaders in the response to and actions arising from evaluations as well as tripartite constituents in the design and review of evaluations. Owing mainly to a constrained enabling environment, time constraints for staff and the sheer volume of evaluations, there is scope to improve the use of evaluations for learning purposes. While independent evaluation for accountability purposes is widely recognized, there is limited evidence of a demand for

evaluative knowledge-sharing between different departments and programmes, or highlighting lessons learnt on what has not worked. These are critical for a healthy evaluative culture that values transparency, lesson-learning and continuous improvement.

18. **The United Nations landscape:** The United Nations evaluation norms and standards give primacy to behavioural independence and organizational independence of the central evaluation function and, in this regard, the ILO's functioning independence, impartiality principles and practices are strong. The ILO has a well-established reputation for the high degree of independence of its evaluation function – in operational and financial terms; for the quality of its evaluations; and for its adherence to United Nations policies, procedures, and best practices. However, the large number of evaluations conducted place significant burdens on staff and key stakeholders, which in turn impacts their capacity to make use of findings in strategic decision-making and lesson-learning. Some United Nations agencies take a more flexible and context-specific, criteria-based approach to evaluations without compromising accountability or independence requirements. With adaptations to the threshold, criteria and scope of independent evaluations (evident in some other United Nations agencies), the workload of already-stretched ILO evaluation staff could be reduced, leaving more time and capacity for evaluative learning and uptake of recommendations. Despite policy commitments and the development of guidance, as well as more attention being paid to gender in quality appraisals of evaluation terms of reference and reports, it is not yet fully mainstreamed throughout evaluation practice and the ILO's evaluation function falls short of meeting UN-SWAP requirements (UN Women, 2020). Fourteen evaluations out of 55 met the UN-SWAP requirements in 2021.

19. **Funding partner engagement:** The ILO's key bilateral and multilateral funding partners as well as joint programmes funded through pooled financing arrangements reveal a mix of evaluation, monitoring and reporting requirements. There are at times divergent views on when and why an independent evaluation should be triggered. While the ILO understandably retains the right to maintain its own standards and policies for evaluation as part of its oversight, and donors at times require separate evaluations to meet their own accountability requirements, there is a risk of duplication and inefficient use of time and resources. For some funding partners, their requirements are not always determined by the size of the budget, in contrast with the ILO's policy. Funding partners welcome collaboration and opportunities for strategic coherence in their support for decent work. They generally have a high regard for the ILO's professionalism in conducting independent evaluations and indicated they would trust the ILO to advise them of opportunities for streamlining and clustering evaluations – particularly where they could yield valuable insights into the impact of the ILO's unique mandate – including social dialogue, tripartism, labour norms and standards.

Progress made since the last independent evaluation of the evaluation function in 2016

20. Of the 13 recommendations made in the last IEE in 2016, good progress has been made on nine of them, including strengthening use of evaluability assessments, inclusion of monitoring and evaluation specialists in decent work teams and projects, expansion of the quality assurance system, high-level evaluations and cluster evaluations, introduction of an automated recommendations tracker, strengthened knowledge management and dissemination of evaluation results.

21. However, less progress has been achieved on four recommendations including the transitioning of regional evaluation officers to EVAL, promotion of gender-responsive and

participatory evaluation, and a more flexible and diverse portfolio of evaluations. Barriers to full implementation mostly arise in the lack of an enabling environment concerning evaluation culture, lack of organizational incentives for participation in evaluation, over-reliance on voluntary evaluation managers, and financial barriers preventing more flexible funding or control of funding for evaluations. Some barriers are linked to evaluation procedures, for example a lack of progress on gender-responsive evaluation.

Conclusions

22. The ILO has a well-developed evaluation function, embedded and highly regarded, with great potential for ensuring that the Organization's decision-making, programming design and implementation are underpinned by useful robust evidence. There are some barriers, challenges and missed opportunities that need to be addressed in the next strategy period, so as to enhance the value of evaluation, prioritize evaluation resources, and improve the culture of evaluation and its critical role in learning and continuous improvement in the ILO. There are opportunities to strengthen and upgrade the evaluation function in terms of impact and maturity.

23. The evidence gathered for this evaluation reveals a system built on a solid strategy, clear mandate and strong operational processes. It has a degree of fragility given the weighty burden on EVAL staff, regional evaluation officers, evaluation managers, external evaluation consultants, and departmental evaluation focal points to deliver its ambitions.

24. **Conclusion 1:** The ILO has a mature, independent evaluation function, with embedded institutionalized systems and processes with recognized quality and credibility. The strengthened communications and knowledge management efforts of EVAL and regional evaluation officers are critical and widely recognized.

25. **Conclusion 2:** Although EVAL has supported extensive learning exercises, the accountability role of evaluations is more visible than learning and improvement. This has influenced the evaluation culture with many participants in this IEE viewing evaluation as a compliance exercise. There is frustration concerning the limited time and opportunity to use evaluations and engage in evaluative practice as a vehicle for critical analysis and continuous improvement. Evaluations do not always ask the right questions that could provide valuable insights into what is working well, less well, and why. A strengthened evaluation function focused on strategic lesson-learning will enhance the delivery and effectiveness of the ILO's strategy and mandate.

26. **Conclusion 3:** There is an expressed demand from the ILO and among constituents for evaluation evidence on impact. This could be better harnessed, particularly as there is an appetite for understanding pathways to impact, and seeing what the ILO's unique contribution is to attain that impact. Assessment of impact requires a robust baseline, integration with intervention design, monitoring, follow-up and adequate funding, sometimes beyond the lifetime of the intervention.

27. **Conclusion 4:** Despite the perseverance of EVAL and the evaluation network to forge ahead with a transformative ambition, this is constrained by barriers in the enabling environment and its own policy guidelines. The volume of evaluations jeopardizes the utility, learning generated, and crucially the capacity to engage in evaluation results and use them to improve design and decision-making. A proportionate approach to evaluation at all levels to ensure optimal use of limited resources is needed, with evaluations that can provide sufficiently robust answers to the questions that can generate the most learning. The evaluation staffing resources are not adequate to meet the demands of the current evaluation strategy and policy. Furthermore, the financial system and funding mechanism are too rigid to allow for pooled

funding for portfolio or cluster evaluations, and for evaluation funds to be spent once a project has ended in terms of ex-post evaluations or longitudinal studies, or cost recovery mechanisms to "payback" or incentivize home departments of evaluation managers.

28. **Conclusion 5:** Independence and impartiality are a key strength and a success for the ILO evaluation function but there are opportunities for a more practical and nuanced approach to upholding independence in the evaluation process. This could involve greater participation of policy departments and field offices to ultimately enhance the relevance, utility and ownership of evaluation processes and results. Harnessing the evaluation skills and knowledge that exist across the entire evaluation function to shape the conversation on effectiveness and performance at the design stage can assist organizational learning. The reliance on EVAL staff for internal real-time quality assurance not only diverts evaluation resources away from delivery of strategic evaluations, but also places at risk the timeliness of evaluation products.

29. **Conclusion 6:** Evaluation is seen as a potentially powerful tool to foster tripartism and social dialogue, and build capacity among all constituents and intended beneficiaries. Opportunities for engagement of constituents in the identification of questions and to absorb and act on the evidence generated are not being maximized. The length of reports, number of standardized questions not tailored to their needs and interests, and a high degree of reliance on eliciting written commentary on documents (terms of reference, draft reports, etc.) do not encourage constituents to participate.

Lessons learned

30. Internal and external coherence: The evaluation function is independent but is an intrinsic part of a system. Coherence across the evaluation function and beyond can help to strengthen ownership and participation of stakeholders, evaluability of programmes, and opportunities for evaluations to provide useful findings, recommendations and lessons.

31. Integration of gender and cross-cutting issues into all stages of programming and evaluation: the evaluation identified opportunities to mainstream gender and cross-cutting issues more systematically in all evaluation stages and deliverables.

32. Embedding evaluative thinking across the Organization: integrating evaluative thinking at all levels provides an opportunity to strengthen results-based management and think about how activities are linked to broader mid-term and long-term goals.

33. Financial and human resource requirements: gaps in resourcing or overworked staff members can compromise sustainability. It is critical that policy decisions be matched with adequate human and financial resources.

34. Balanced incentives and accountability: institutional systems and accountability frameworks need to strive continually to incorporate both rewards and clear accountability requirements.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

35. *Maintain EVAL's independence through its organizational location and make more strategic use of the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) as an influential body. Use the time of EAC members more strategically to generate more focused discussion of evaluation insights and implications arising.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
Director-General with EVAL support, EAC members	High	Short-term	None

Recommendation 2

36. *Use evaluation resources more strategically, stringently prioritize and plan while maintaining commitment to improve results-based management system. Reduce the number of evaluations conducted for smaller projects or where evidence is already strong and ensure ability and agility to direct resources to areas of least evidence, risk or innovation.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
EVAL and EAC members	High	Short-term	None
PARDEV and PROGRAM (in relation to strengthening monitoring as a key form of accountability and course correction mechanism)	High	Medium-term	High

Recommendation 3

37. *Strengthen the enabling environment. Ensure adequate financial and human resources in terms of level and modality for evaluation to deliver a transformative evaluation ambition. Ensure that the ILO's financial process and mechanisms allow for ease of creation of pooled funds, ex-post evaluation funding and cluster evaluations.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
FINANCE, PROGRAM, PARDEV and SMT (for recommendation relating to resource allocation and pooling)	High	Short-term	None
EVAL	Medium	Short-term	Medium

Recommendation 4

38. *Strengthen the enabling environment. Invest in building the capabilities and skills to undertake, manage and use evaluations. Professionalize, incentivize and recognize evaluation skills.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
EVAL and HRD	Medium	Medium-term	Medium

Recommendation 5

39. *Strengthen the enabling environment. Promote a culture of collaboration, continuous learning, professional development through evaluation design, delivery and follow-up. Invest in forging stronger links between monitoring, learning and evaluation that enable evidence-*

based decision-making. Incentivize honest and open discussion on what is working less well, allow for adaptation and continuous learning.

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
SMT, EVAL, PARDEV, field and policy directors, knowledge management coordination team/senior responsible for Knowledge Management Gateway	High	Medium-term	None

Recommendation 6

40. *Ensure quality, credibility and utility of evaluations. Improve the design of evaluations to focus only on the most relevant issues. Improve the quality of evaluation recommendations with a greater utility focus. Expand the real-time quality assurance of high-level evaluations independent from EVAL.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
EVAL, PROGRAM, field directors, policy departments and PARDEV	Low	Medium-term	Medium

Recommendation 7

41. *Invest in knowledge capture and information management systems. Enable more synergy between evaluations and other learning products such as project reporting, research and other knowledge products. Introduce an accounting code for evaluation to enable EVAL to track and analyse expenditure on evaluations. Continue to ensure all project evaluations are accessible on* i-*eval Discovery while allowing for tagging of evaluations by ILO strategic objectives and results.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
FINANCE	Low	Medium-term	None
EVAL, Knowledge Management and RESEARCH, PARDEV, regions	Low	Medium-term	High

Recommendation 8

42. *Continue and expand the ILO's commitment to the United Nations evaluation system. Continue to share the ILO's evaluation expertise and knowledge with the United Nations evaluation network and other United Nations organizations. Enhance coherence, minimize overlaps and avoid overburdening stakeholders, seek opportunities for collaboration and coordination among United Nations Evaluation Group members, where appropriate and feasible.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
EVAL	High	Medium-term	None

Recommendation 9

43. *Build on strong foundations to develop a future-fit evaluation strategy and policy. Update policy guidelines related to prioritization recommendations, quality assurance and independence mechanisms. EVAL should develop its strategic approach to impact evaluation – EVAL and the EAC should have a stronger voice in determining impact evaluations undertaken as well as project/programme leads and funding partners.*

Responsible unit	Priority	Time implications	Resource implications
EVAL	High	Short-term	None

Management response

44. The Office welcomes the findings of the independent evaluation of the evaluation function. The management response below addresses the recommendations. Further refinement of the management response to the recommendations will be reflected in the outline of the updated evaluation strategy included in GB.346/PFA/6.

Recommendations	Office response	EVAL observation
Recommendation 1	The independence of EVAL and reporting lines to the Director-General and Governing Body, as determined by IGDS No. 75 (Version 3) and the 2017 evaluation policy, are valued by the Office and the constituents. The role of the EAC and its membership will be reviewed to further enhance the strategic role it has played so far in ensuring evaluation uptake for decision-making and fostering of an enabling environment for influential evaluation.	EVAL will continue to ensure that the evaluation function follows internationally recognized standards and good practices. EVAL will produce scenarios for consideration by the Director-General and senior management on how to optimize the role of the EAC, including through the establishment of regional subcommittees.
Recommendation 2	The Office recognizes the need for a balance between accountability and organizational learning. EVAL will explore innovative and agile ways to further reduce the number of evaluations without compromising on accountability and the need to generate evaluation evidence. It is acknowledged that this will require efforts to strengthen monitoring and reporting as accountability and course correction mechanisms.	EVAL has proactively explored options to reduce evaluation fatigue and experimented with alternative evaluation models, notably through clustering, which has already led to a substantial decline in the number of evaluations. Based on scenarios presented in the IEE report, EVAL will review new criteria-based mechanisms to decide on thresholds for independent evaluation as part of annual regional and departmental negotiated-planning processes focused on learning needs.
Recommendation 3	Resources for conducting evaluations will continue to be secured in the regular budget and included in project budgets to ensure that evaluations are considered an integral part of the programme and of project	EVAL welcomes the ring-fencing mechanism within the resource allocation system of the programme and budget and development cooperation projects. It will propose scenarios for a flexible financial

Recommendations	Office response	EVAL observation
	implementation cycles. A more efficient and strategic use of extrabudgetary evaluation funds will be explored by integrating all budget sources.	process that allows for project evaluation funds to be strategically pooled and applied to clustered, ex-post and impact evaluations as called for in the 2017 evaluation policy.
Recommendation 4	The Office recognizes the improvements needed to strengthen the evaluation culture in the ILO. The Office will work on the implementation of appropriate measures to support tailored initiatives to strengthen evaluation competencies among ILO staff.	EVAL will continue to pursue with the Office innovative ways to professionalize, incentivize, and recognize evaluation skills and related duties of staff in the ILO, notably through capacity strengthening, additional credit in performance appraisals and cost-recovery mechanisms to recoup time devoted by staff members to evaluation tasks.
Recommendation 5	The Office considers the importance of strengthening the role of evaluation throughout the results-based management cycle to enhance evidence-based decision-making, ensuring links between evaluation and research, knowledge management, learning, innovation, development cooperation and strategies within specific policy areas. To support the strategic role of evaluation, other forms of accountability will be further promoted.	The Theory of Change for the updated evaluation strategy will identify strategic initiatives and expected outcomes for the enabling environment based on a mapping of learning and evidence-generating processes in the ILO. EVAL will, on a consultative basis, ensure that the key initiatives in the enabling environment are identified as indispensable prerequisites for evaluation to continue contributing to effective learning and evidence-based decision-making.
Recommendation 6	The Office takes note of the constant need to ensure the quality, credibility and utility of evaluations and welcomes the suggestions provided. The Office will ensure that both centralized and decentralized evaluations are participatory-based and utilization-focused. The existing quality assurance mechanism will continue to incorporate high-level evaluations on a rolling basis.	During the updated evaluation strategy period (2022–25), EVAL will continue to upgrade its well-established systems for quality assurance of centralized and decentralized evaluations, both on a real-time and an ex-post basis. Strategic evaluation planning combined with targeted evaluation models will be a means to enhance the value added. Evaluation guidelines and approaches will continue to be updated to reflect the ILO's specific mandate while maintaining quality.
Recommendation 7	The Office recognizes the need to invest in knowledge capture and knowledge management systems. The Office also welcomes the suggestions on how to better capture evaluation information	In collaboration with INFOTEC since 2021, EVAL has been re-engineering its i-Track database and *i*-eval discovery display to improve its functionality and usability. The new

Recommendations	Office response	EVAL observation
	and to increase synergy between evaluations, projects and research reports. The Office has made significant investments in these areas and will continue to invest in state-of-the-art systems in the upcoming strategy period.	database will allow for better capturing of evaluative information and will provide a fully interactive process for completing evaluations. EVAL will invest in improving knowledge systems to continue to stay ahead of innovative advancements, which have been recognized and emulated by other United Nations agencies over the previous strategy period.
Recommendation 8	The Office recognizes the importance of strengthening links with other United Nations entities to carry out relevant evaluations, particularly at the country level. The Office will continue working to ensure that the United Nations system fully considers the ILO's specific mandate and priorities in joint and system-wide evaluations, through active participation in the United Nations evaluation network and other United Nations organizations.	EVAL will continue to include in the updated evaluation strategy relevant initiatives in the United Nations system, particular at the country level where it supports the work of the constituents. This will be based on a continuing assessment of the added value of the ILO's involvement and strategic opportunities for sharing the ILO's evaluation expertise and knowledge that provide maximum return, given the limited capacity of a relatively small ILO evaluation function.
Recommendation 9	The Office will update policy guidelines during the development of the new evaluation strategy considering the recommendations of the IEE, the recent Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) assessment and guidance from the Governing Body, with particular focus on enhancing evaluations' value to demonstrate the impact of the ILO's work and to promote evidence-based learning and decision-making.	The updated evaluation strategy will be based on a consultative and participatory process as for the previous strategy. The approval of the outline in GB.346/PFA/6 by the Governing Body will pave the way to follow-up on identified issues regarding updates to the policy guidelines in accordance with paragraph 26 of the 2017 policy as well as the role and expected contribution of all parts of the ILO to the strategic importance of impact evaluation.

▶ Draft decision

45. **The Governing Body requested the Director-General to take into consideration the recommendations of the independent evaluation presented in document GB.346/PFA/8, and to ensure their appropriate implementation.**