



General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 July 2020
English

Original: English

**Executive Committee of the
High Commissioner's Programme
Seventy-first session**
Geneva, 5-9 October 2020
Item 5 of the provisional agenda
**Consideration of reports relating to programme
and administrative oversight and evaluation**

Report on evaluation

Report of the High Commissioner

Summary

This report, covering the period from July 2019 to June 2020, is provided pursuant to the decision of the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme to consider reports relating to programme and administrative oversight and evaluation during its annual plenary session (A/AC.96/1003, para. 25(1)(f)(vi)).



Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1-5	3
II. Evaluation coverage and quality	6-8	3
III. Relevance and utilization	9-14	4
IV. Evaluation highlights.....	15-24	5
V. Building UNHCR's evaluation capacity	25	8
VI. Linkages: evaluation, results-based management and oversight	26-28	9
VII. United Nations system reform and inter-agency evaluations	29-30	9

I. Introduction

1. In the twelve months covered by this report, July 2019 - June 2020, two events have taken place that have had a deep impact on UNHCR, its way of working and the people of concern to the organization. As set out in the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), the first Global Refugee Forum was convened in December 2019 to strengthen international solidarity and better support the world's refugees and the countries and communities that host them. The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and its negative secondary impacts have affected refugees and others of concern to UNHCR. The global pandemic has also forced the organization to rapidly change its ways of working, including the support functions and underpinning business processes.

2. For the evaluation function in UNHCR, this context has created challenges, but also opportunities. Delivering on the evaluation workplan became a challenge due to the international and national restrictions on movement and other disruptions that have impacted travel, security, staff and programme delivery. At the same time, this was an opportunity to mainstream evaluation in the broader context of national and international policies and COVID-19 responses, in line with the GCR. The Evaluation Service has seized the opportunity to use new remote approaches to conduct evaluations and to make fuller use of existing evaluative evidence. During the period covered in this report, UNHCR completed 20 independent evaluative exercises (table 1) and initiated another 19, each aligned with strategic priority areas of its work.

3. June 2020 marks the mid-point in the implementation of UNHCR's evaluation strategy (2018-2022)¹. The demand for evaluations has increased, as has the number of evaluations conducted by the organization. Expenditure and staffing for evaluation have grown and new guidance has been developed. Furthermore, new resources and systems were put into place to respond to decentralization within the organization and to strengthen both the quality and use of evaluations.

4. UNHCR's evaluation workplan for 2020-2021 is ambitious, with 35 evaluations underway or starting over the course of the next year. The Office is engaged in joint evaluations and contributes to the United Nations reform efforts through its engagement with the United Nations Evaluation Group and by aligning evaluation agendas – in particular with regard to the international COVID-19 response. In this context, UNHCR is forging a coalition with member States and other UN agencies to look at evaluating the effectiveness of international and bilateral cooperation on the adherence to international obligations with respect to the rights of people of concern to UNHCR.

5. This paper reports on progress towards achieving the four objectives set out in the evaluation strategy, namely: i) increasing evaluation coverage and quality; ii) improving the relevance and utilization of evaluation findings; iii) building capacity to undertake and use evaluations; and iv) strengthening an evaluation function that is linked to other complementary functions, such as oversight, strategic planning, monitoring, data and analytics, and results-based management. It also looks at the implementation of the programme of work from July 2019 through June 2020 and reflects on major emerging findings and lessons learned from the evaluations.

II. Evaluation coverage and quality

6. The current evaluation policy was approved in 2016. That year, the organization published two centralized and two decentralized evaluations. Since then, the number and coverage of evaluations has quadrupled and the approved evaluation budget for 2020 stands at \$11.5 million (0.2 per cent of programme expenditure²). While centralized evaluations continued to look at questions of organizational strategy, decentralized evaluations offered

¹ <https://www.unhcr.org/5a93c8637.pdf>.

² The United Nations Office for Internal Oversight (OIOS) minimum benchmark is 0.5 per cent of programme expenditure.

expanded scope for responding to programmatic issues and learning – particularly at the regional and country levels. In 2020, the Evaluation Service mapped the geographic coverage of evaluations conducted over the past five years, which showed that almost half³ of UNHCR’s operations have been evaluated during the period.

7. In line with the evaluation strategy, the Evaluation Service is expanding its regional presence through recruiting and out-posting Senior Evaluation Officers in regional bureaux to better support the decentralization process. During 2019 and 2020, one position was established in the Americas, with two further staff members being recruited in the regional bureaux for the East and Horn of Africa and Great Lakes region; and for West and Central Africa. Enhanced engagement in regional and country planning processes has led to the establishment of regional evaluation strategies⁴, which will considerably expand evaluation coverage from January 2021 onwards.

8. External reviews conducted by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN)⁵ and the United Nations Office for Internal Oversight (OIOS) in 2017 and 2018 suggested that the quality of UNHCR’s evaluations was mixed. To address problems related to quality, guidance was finalized to support UNHCR personnel who manage decentralized evaluations (many with limited evaluation experience) and mentoring approaches were strengthened. In 2020 the Evaluation Service is also piloting an external quality review and assessment procedure for evaluation reports, which is expected to lead to higher levels of consistency and quality across evaluation processes and deliverables. External reviews will also allow the service to measure and report on evaluation quality in a systematic and transparent way and to identify areas for improvement.

III. Relevance and utilization

9. Evaluations need to be relevant and responsive to the decision-making needs of the organization and its key stakeholders. They should be timely, of high quality and communicated in appropriate formats. Demand, engagement and ownership by operations, bureaux, divisions and internal services are central.

10. During 2019-2020 the Evaluation Service has invested heavily in responding to important challenges faced by the organization – including the COVID-19 pandemic. One staff member of the Evaluation Service worked with the internal COVID-19 analytical team in support of longer-term forecasting of the impacts of the pandemic on people of concern to UNHCR. The service prepared two briefs (lessons learned from the response to Ebola in refugee settings and a synthesis of key learning from evaluations related to UNHCR’s main COVID-19 scale-up strategies); offered to conduct a rapid review of business continuity in the first three months of the crisis; and worked with the Inspector Generals’ Office and OIOS to adapt oversight plans to situational challenges and priorities. An approach to evaluating UNHCR’s response to COVID-19 that mainstreams relevant questions into ongoing and new evaluations has been developed to avoid burdening operations with additional reporting requests.

11. UNHCR’s Evaluation Service is currently developing a communication strategy. It has recruited additional expertise with the ambition of strengthening engagement with different audiences and preparing more targeted evaluation products. The service is piloting an assessment of how evaluations have had an impact on decision-making in UNHCR over time, for example through the implementation of evaluation recommendations.

12. The Evaluation Service continues to develop methodological approaches that provide inputs to decision-making processes in real time. The continued roll-out of multi-year

³. Over 60 countries have been covered by evaluations and evaluation case studies over the period.

⁴. The regional evaluation strategy for the Americas for 2020-2022 outlines up to 10 potential evaluations.

⁵. [http://www.mopanonline.org/assessments/unhcr2017-18/UNHCR%20Brief%20\[web-1\].pdf](http://www.mopanonline.org/assessments/unhcr2017-18/UNHCR%20Brief%20[web-1].pdf) and OIOS United Nations Evaluation Dashboard 2016/17

longitudinal evaluations⁶ enables UNHCR to build cumulative evidence to inform course correction as needed, while supporting wider organizational learning in strategic areas. There are currently three longitudinal evaluations underway: i) UNHCR's engagement in humanitarian-development cooperation 2018-2021; ii) Implementation of UNHCR's 2018 age, gender and diversity policy; and iii) UNHCR's emergency response to the Venezuela situation 2019-2020.

13. The Evaluation Service has introduced several practices that have created greater ownership of evaluation processes and learning within the organization. The first is the inclusion of Evaluation Managers, together with the independent evaluation team, during the critically important inception phase of an evaluation. Joint inception missions help to ensure that independent evaluation teams understand the organization, and that the operation understands the purpose and aims of the evaluation. Critically, this practice helps to promote the utility of the evaluation without compromising the independence of the evaluation process. The second good practice example is the use of validation workshops, facilitated by the independent evaluation team, following completion of data collection and analysis. The workshop format allows for open dialogue and discussion on key findings and their possible implications, and supports a collaborative approach to identifying, framing and soliciting "buy-in" for forward-looking and useful recommendations.

14. The Evaluation Service has also provided tailored support for exercises which, while not evaluations, are evaluative in nature and require objective assessment approaches. Examples include the Independent Donor Assessment Review and the desk review on UNHCR's leadership and coordination in refugee response settings, undertaken for the Division of External Relations. The Evaluation Service participation in real-time reviews of level 3 emergencies, led by the Division of Emergency Security Supply (DESS) is another example of an approach that brings evaluative thinking to management decision-making, contributing to a stronger organizational evaluation culture. Direct technical support has also been provided to colleagues in the Division of Resilience and Solutions and the Division of International Protection in evaluation preparedness or evaluability of education and resettlement activities, establishing the groundwork for better evaluations in the future, by increasing their awareness, interest and capacity.

IV Evaluation highlights

15. The following paragraphs highlight key strategic findings that have emerged from the 20 evaluative exercises completed over the past 12 months. Executive summaries and full evaluation reports – as well as their management responses – can be found on UNHCR's website.⁷ The evaluation workplan 2020-2021 is also published on this page.

16. Over the last 18 months, the Evaluation Service has commissioned four country operations evaluations, namely in Afghanistan, Angola, Iraq and Morocco which looked at the entire portfolio of UNHCR's work over a 3-5-year period. While each evaluation generated findings specific to the country context, several common lessons were identified.

- A need to firm up the thematic boundaries of UNHCR operations. The application of GCR principles and UNHCR's new policy on internally displaced persons (IDPs) have paved the way for new areas of intervention. This is especially true in complex environments, such as Afghanistan and Iraq, where people of concern to include returnees, IDPs and refugees. However, to ensure the continued strategic coherence of UNHCR operations, and to minimize the risk of new programme strands stretching beyond available capacities, a degree of consolidation may be necessary. This must be informed by a clear rationale for prioritization, based on UNHCR's mandate, comparative advantage and core areas of competence.

⁶ Longitudinal evaluations comprise repeated rounds of evaluative work over time, bringing learning into policy and programming during the process.

⁷ See: <https://www.unhcr.org/evaluation-and-research.html>

- To stretch or to link up? The countries studied have shown clearly that progress towards GCR goals requires programme inputs that are often, both in scale and nature, outside the scope of UNHCR's mandate or areas of expertise. UNHCR country offices have pragmatically explored two distinct avenues to address this. First by acquiring new capabilities in sectors, such as job creation and social services, and secondly, by building linkages between UNHCR and development actors. While each of these approaches comes with benefits and shortcomings, the final analysis shows that linking up is the preferable option. Better modalities for UNHCR's partnership with development actors need to be identified.
- Advocating for a paradigm shift in development programming in fragile and conflict-affected States. In pursuing the GCR goals together with development actors, the readiness of prospective partners to engage with UNHCR is critical. In Angola and Morocco, the contribution of development agencies to GCR programme strands is in line with the mainly development-oriented agenda of aid agencies there. In fragile and conflict-affected States (FCAS), such as Afghanistan and Iraq, convergence and synergies between UNHCR and development actors have been much harder to achieve. Development agencies often have a light operational footprint, with development programmes being primarily delivered through host governments. Where a government's capacity and performance are limited, as is often the case in FCAS, development programmes are considerably harder to deliver on the ground. Therefore, in FCAS settings the constraints inherent in weak state capacity call for a new paradigm in which development actors can engage more directly with their government counterparts in joint programme delivery.

17. The evaluation of UNHCR and the Government of Colombia's joint plan for the protection and assistance of IDPs, 2015-2019, found that the plan was relevant to the goal of ending armed conflict and the "unconstitutional state of affairs" (Constitutional Court Sentence T 025, 2004.) The main results achieved were: (i) institutional capacity developed for the prevention, protection, assistance and reparations to the displaced population, and (ii) stronger community-level capacity for decision making and achievement of solutions. The evaluation noted a reduction in contributions over the period, as many donors shifted resources to the Venezuela crisis (funding to support the Joint Plan fell by 33 per cent). Many achievements were assessed to be highly sustainable, in particular those related to urban and territorial legality, collaboration between local and national institutions, and the integration of programmes and policy for IDPs into municipal planning, as well as to community-level infrastructure and participation, visible replication of good practices, and the collective protections accorded under Decree 2078. The evaluation documented five main lessons learned and recommendations to be heeded in the next planning cycle – with a particular focus on the need for UNHCR to strengthen collaboration with government, civil society and community groups and to adopt sustainability measures to ensure that progress continues after UNHCR interventions end.

18. Bangladesh is host to one of the most challenging refugee crises in the world, and one of UNHCR's biggest operations. An independent synthesis was commissioned to maximize learning across a set of three evaluations conducted by UNHCR⁸, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) covering the period 2017-2019. The synthesis established that the rapid scale up by all three agencies and the provision of essential services and assistance had saved lives. Nevertheless, according to the independent evaluation teams, the lack of physical and protection space impacted heavily on the quality of service delivery, and the focus on coverage, rather than quality, of the response persisted for too long.

19. While there were gaps, especially in protection mainstreaming, the fact that refugee mortality largely remained under control was a major achievement. While inter-agency coordination had been contentious in the initial phase of the response, the evaluations found that coordination mechanisms had largely stabilized by 2019. The evaluation synthesis emphasized the need for planning for medium- and longer-term scenarios in a coordinated

⁸. UNHCR's evaluation on the operation in Bangladesh was presented to the 69th plenary session of the Executive Committee. See: A/AC.96/1183, July 2018.

manner, despite the challenges. Additional investments in national and local capacities and systems will be critical in developing a sustainable way forward. A strategy of care and maintenance will not suffice in the medium to long terms and durable solution will need to be found for refugees.

20. UNHCR is currently developing a global livelihoods and economic inclusion strategy, aligned with the principles of the GCR and the Grand Bargain. Findings from a series of livelihoods evaluations carried out over 2018-2020 have highlighted that UNHCR-supported livelihood activities provided important benefits to targeted groups of people of concern. These included improved relationships between people of concern and host communities; a reduction in negative coping mechanisms such as reducing meals, early marriage; and improved food security. Evaluations from the Dollo Ado region in Ethiopia found some interventions to be more successful than others depending on the capacity of farmers groups/cooperatives; the degree of market integration and the diversity of market linkages. However, traditional small-scale and project-based livelihood activities provided limited impact on income and economic inclusion of refugees more broadly. This points to the need for an increased focus on market-based self-reliance approaches, advocacy and working through strategic partnerships. As this represents a significant shift in UNHCR's role, change management support was recommended, as well as strengthening the skills of personnel in monitoring and evaluation, advocacy and coordination. Key internal procedures and mechanisms to support this strategy will include greater use of data-sharing platforms, joint fundraising, flexible budget allocations, and multi-year planning. The evaluation proposed a self-reliance and resilience analytical tool in support of UNHCR livelihood strategy development at country level.

21. The longitudinal evaluation of UNHCR's engagement in humanitarian-development cooperation, focuses on emerging practice and lessons learned in four operations in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Jordan and Niger over the period 2018-2021. An initial "think piece" that synthesized key reflections across all four case study contexts was published in 2019, and noted the following:

- UNHCR mainly engaged in humanitarian-development cooperation in four ways: by providing different kinds of support to development actors to catalyse their engagement on forced displacement; by leveraging the influence of development actors for advocacy on host government policies; by gradually linking services for refugees to national or local systems; and by mobilizing development resources to expand UNHCR's work on self-reliance.
- There is real value for both UNHCR and development actors in partnering together. Beyond access to data on people of concern to UNHCR, the organization can offer support to other organizations in tangible and practical ways, such as access to local government structures and presence in the deep field.
- UNHCR's core protection mandate is valued, but the organization could also consider more practical support in areas such as translating legal and national policy into guidance that can help governments and development actors to integrate protection into national policies and development programmes.
- Even where development actors engage and where refugee inclusion/integration of refugees and other people of concern has been achieved, ongoing support (operational/financial) from UNHCR will often be required.

22. The protracted and multidimensional character of recent refugee crises, mixed movements, conflict-related displacement and shifts in the humanitarian and development landscape (including in relation to the GCR) have had significant implications for UNHCR's role in leading and coordinating refugee and humanitarian responses. Against this background, UNHCR commissioned an independent review of its leadership and coordination role in refugee settings over the period 2014 - 2018. Several other evaluations touch on the topic of coordination and leadership and are drawn on below.

- The independent review found that while prescribed or predetermined or standardized approaches to coordination structure may exist on paper, they are less evident on the ground. Coordination models and practices are dynamic and oscillate in reaction to

local and global political situations. Hosting States as well as donors have significant influence over the types of coordination structures that emerge and the space that is granted to UNHCR to facilitate broad and inclusive refugee and IDP responses.

- The review noted that the quality of leadership “on the ground” is essential to UNHCR’s coordination role, including the ability to be sensitive to the needs of stakeholders, partners and governments while maintaining robust advocacy on the centrality of protection. Without prescribing a “cookie-cutter” approach, the review suggested that further development of senior staff leadership skills and styles would be required to deliver on the GCR. This and other evaluative exercises suggest that some of UNHCR’s internal processes and mechanisms (such as job descriptions, performance reviews and operational planning) could better reflect the importance that needs to be given by personnel to their roles of coordination.

23. The evaluative review of the “Global strategy: beyond detention” examined UNHCR’s efforts to find alternatives to detention. The strategy was found to be broad enough to provide a global guiding framework for legal and operational engagement on detention, yet at the same time flexible enough to allow for adaptation to national contexts. The strategy recognized the importance of developing and strengthening partnerships – the impact of the enhanced partnerships could particularly be seen in the areas of judicial engagement, piloting alternatives to detention and more regular monitoring of detention facilities. At a more strategic level, however, the reviewers felt that the “Global strategy: beyond detention” could have further capitalized on its tools and instruments in efforts to address the detention of both migrants and refugees. The review noted that UNHCR could do more to highlight the tools and approaches of the strategy and cooperate with partners working in the area of migrant detention. It also identified scope for greater engagement by UNHCR’s regional bureaux to improve regional engagement and more harmonized approaches among countries.

24. The Evaluation Service periodically analyses key findings and lessons that are emerging from recent UNHCR evaluations. Our 2020 analysis identified several broad cross-cutting themes that could benefit from further reflection and deeper analysis through future evaluations:

- Building broader and stronger relationships with a wider array of national government line ministries in refugee hosting countries: Evaluations have found that in many country operation contexts UNHCR works closely with one principle national counterpart government agency, and that its access to other government institutions is mediated through this single body. UNHCR’s relationship with other national government institutions is thus often highly dependent on the national counterpart agencies’ capacities and relations with other ministries. To address this, UNHCR is increasingly expanding partnerships and exploring multi-stakeholder approaches with a broad range of actors, including United Nations and donor development agencies, multilateral development banks and financial institutions, who have privileged relationships with different parts of government. Evaluative evidence also indicates that UNHCR, with its extensive field presence, has often built strong working relationships with local government institutions, which directly supports the effective delivery of protection and solutions in some refugee hosting areas.
- Addressing challenges in policy implementation: UNHCR evaluations have highlighted continued success in advocacy for positive changes in national asylum laws and policies, including on the right to work, freedom of movement and inclusion in national services. However, analysis suggests further work is required to ensure barriers and obstacles to policy implementation are identified, understood and addressed, particularly in the challenging context as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

V Capacity building

25. During the first six months of 2020, the Evaluation Service developed an online webinar together with UNHCR’s Global Learning and Development Centre as part of the compliance in programme management learning programme webinar series. A total of

143 programme and project control officers, working in country offices and regional bureaux, participated in the webinar. Consideration is being given to further professionalizing evaluation amongst mid-level personnel through mainstreaming evaluation across UNHCR's learning offers and creating a regionalized training-of-trainers process.

VI Linkages: evaluation, results-based management and oversight

26. In 2019 the new Division of Strategic Planning and Results (DSPR) was established to strengthen UNHCR's programming, planning, budgeting and partner management. DSPR also plays a lead role in establishing the organization's performance monitoring and results management system. The Evaluation Service is engaging in a systematic way with the new Division. Specifically, it is supporting the roll-out of the results-based management system, ensuring that evaluation plays a key role at different stages of the programme cycle.

27. At the end of 2019 a new policy on independent oversight in UNHCR was approved. Its aim is to promote and enhance organizational accountability – while recognizing the different but complementary roles that the evaluation, audit, inspection, and other functions play in promoting learning and ensuring accountability. During the first half of 2020, the heads of oversight functions met regularly, including to discuss the oversight response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the follow-up on oversight findings and recommendations. With respect to follow-up on recommendations, there is scope for improving the timeliness of management responses to evaluations. While the evaluation policy requires submission within two months, on average responses are being submitted three months after an evaluation.

28. With respect to linkages with other units engaged in generating evidence within UNHCR, the Evaluation Service is working with the division of resilience and Solution and others engaged in research on forced displacement. The service has also started to explore the potential for expanded collaboration with the Joint Data Centre towards a more systematic use of UNHCR refugee registration data in the context of evaluations.

VII United Nations system reform and inter-agency evaluations

29. UNHCR continues to contribute in a systematic way to inter-agency evaluation efforts, playing a strong technical and leadership role. Of note during the past 12 months have been the revision of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation ethical principles; the development of a draft system-wide evaluation policy (which was the foundation for the UN Secretary-Generals' proposal to the United Nations Economic and Social Council⁹; the election of the UNHCR Head of Evaluation as Vice-Chair of the Executive Steering Committee in UNEG; and the conduct of a number of system-wide and joint evaluations. These include: i) the response to the droughts in Ethiopia; ii) the cyclone response in Mozambique; iii) the refugee response synthesis in Bangladesh, and iv) an inter-agency synthesis of evaluations that have looked at the United Nations collective response to "Children on the move". The Evaluation Service is also supporting the joint evaluation of UNAIDS Joint Programme's work on preventing and responding to gender-based violence against women and girls, and in particular the adaptations to the Joint Programme's interventions as a result of the increase in gender-based violence during the COVID-19 pandemic.

30. Looking forward, two important opportunities present themselves. The first, acting as UNEG focal point, the Head of Evaluation will play an influential role in the newly established core group of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) that will lead the COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition. This will allow UNHCR to advocate for refugees and other displaced groups to be central in planned evaluations in 2020-2021. Second, in accordance with UNHCR's evaluation policy 2016, the High Commissioner has formally requested that an UNEG/DAC

⁹. See: <https://undocs.org/A/74/73>

professional peer review of UNHCR's evaluation function be conducted in early 2021. This will provide important elements for the formulation of a revised policy later next year.

Table 1 - Overview of completed evaluations, July 2019 - June 2020.

<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Countries concerned</i>
<i>Centralized</i>	
1. UNHCR country operations evaluation: Angola (2016-2019)	Angola
2. UNHCR country operations evaluation: Morocco (2016-2019)	Morocco
3. UNHCR country operations evaluation: Iraq (2018-2019)	Iraq
4. UNHCR country operations evaluation: Afghanistan (2016-2019)	Afghanistan
5. Evaluation of UNHCR's engagement in humanitarian-development cooperation: year one think piece	Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Jordan, and Niger
6. SGBV response, risk mitigation and prevention in humanitarian crises: synthesis of evaluations	Brazil, Lebanon, western United Republic of Tanzania,
7. Evaluation of UNHCR's data use and information management approaches	Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Zambia
8. Independent desk review of UNHCR's leadership and coordination role in refugee response settings	Global
9. Evaluation of UNHCR's engagement with the private sector	Global with country visits to Kenya and Malaysia
10. UNHCR/Danida - the integrated solutions model in and around Kalobeyei, Turkana, Kenya	Kenya
11. Synthesis of Rohingya response evaluations of IOM, UNICEF and UNHCR	Bangladesh
<i>Decentralized</i>	
12. Decentralized evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods programme in Malaysia (2015-2018)	Malaysia
13. Decentralized evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods programme in Mauritania (2017-2018)	Mauritania
14. Decentralized evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods programme in Djibouti (2015-2018)	Djibouti
15. Decentralized evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods programme in Senegal (2017-2018)	Senegal
16. Decentralized evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods programme in South Sudan (2016-2018)	South Sudan
17. Evaluation of UNHCR prevention of and response to SGBV in Brazil focussing on the population of concern from Venezuela (2017-2018)	Brazil

<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Countries concerned</i>
18. Independent desk review of UNHCR's global strategy – beyond Detention 2014 -2019	Global
19. Evaluation of four-year plan UNHCR-Government of Colombia (2015-2019)	Colombia
20. Baseline evaluation of the Ikea Foundation livelihoods and energy projects among Somali refugees and host communities in Melkadida, Ethiopia	Ethiopia

Table 2 - Overview of ongoing and planned evaluations, July 2020 - June 2021

<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Countries concerned</i>
<i>Centralized</i>	
1. Evaluation of UNHCR's country strategy in Egypt	Egypt
2. Evaluation of UNHCR's country strategy in Ukraine	Ukraine
3. Evaluation of UNHCR's country strategy in Myanmar	Myanmar
4. Evaluation of UNHCR's engagement in humanitarian-development cooperation year two and three (2019 - 2021)	Bangladesh, Niger, Jordan, Ethiopia
5. Evaluation of the UNHCR regional refugee response to the Venezuela situation	Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru
6. Evaluation of UNHCR's L3 emergency response to Cyclone Idai in Zimbabwe and Malawi	Malawi, Zimbabwe
7. Multi-year evaluation of the implementation of UNHCR's 2018 age, gender and diversity policy (2019-2022) - Year 1	Chad, Greece, Kenya, Mexico and Thailand
8. Evaluation of UNHCR's approaches to learning and development	In depth: Greece, Nigeria, light touch: Djibouti Morocco, Peru,
9. Evaluation of UNHCR's L3 emergency response in Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso
10. Evaluation of UNHCR's L2 emergency response in Niger	Niger
11. Evaluation of UNHCR's L3 response in the Democratic Republic of Congo	Democratic Republic of Congo
12. Evaluation of UNHCR's country operation in Zambia	Zambia
13. Evaluation of UNHCR-led initiatives to end Statelessness	Côte d' Ivoire, Kenya, Philippines, Tajikistan or Kyrgyzstan, and regional case studies
14. Real-time Evaluation of UNHCR L2 response in COVID affected countries	To be determined
15. Evaluation of UNHCR's country operation in Uganda	Uganda

<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Countries concerned</i>
16. Independent evaluation of UNHCR's support for strengthening national asylum systems	To be determined
17. Synthesis protection evaluations	To be determined
18. Evaluability assessment for collective evaluation of GCR	
<i>Decentralized</i>	
19. Evaluation of the effects of UNHCR's cash-based interventions on protection outcomes in Rwanda	Rwanda
20. Multi-phased evaluation of the Ikea Foundation livelihoods and energy Projects among Somali Refugees and host communities in Ethiopia	Ethiopia
21. Independent evaluation of UNHCR's innovation fund	Headquarters, Geneva
22. Independent review of individual donor assessments	Headquarters, Geneva
23. Synthesis of livelihoods evaluations in 5 Country case studies	Djibouti, Malaysia, Mauritania, Senegal and South Sudan
24. Evaluation on the relevance and effectiveness of sports programming for refugee inclusion and protection	Rwanda, Mexico
25. Evaluation of the "Caring for refugees with non-communicable diseases" project	Algeria, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania,
26. Evaluation of the project "Saving maternal and newborn lives in refugee situations in Chad"	Chad
27. Evaluation of the project "Saving maternal and newborn lives in refugee Situations in Cameroon"	Cameroon
28. Evaluation of the project "Saving maternal and newborn lives in refugee situations in Niger"	Niger
29. Decentralized evaluation of UNHCR's livelihoods programme in the Syrian Arab Republic	Syrian Arab republic
30. Evaluation of UK Home Office alternatives to detention community engagement pilot series	United Kingdom
31. Evaluation of telling the real story project 2.0	To be determined
<i>UN System-wide/joint evaluations</i>	
32. Inter-agency humanitarian evaluation of gender equality	Bangladesh, Colombia, Iraq and Nigeria
33. Inter-agency humanitarian evaluation of Yemen humanitarian response	Yemen

<i>Evaluations</i>	<i>Countries concerned</i>
34. Evaluation of the joint programmes - preventing and responding to gender-based violence (ILO, UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF UNHCR)	12 countries-6 light and 6 in-depth (TBD)
35. Real-time evaluation of UNHCR/UNICEF roadmap for refugee children	Bangladesh, Cameroon, Ecuador Ethiopia, Honduras, Iraq, Kenya and Libya
