

**DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE  
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE**

**DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

**Summary Record of the 25th Meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

16-18 June 2020, Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Following written input from EvalNet on a DRAFT, this summary record is issued as FINAL.

The 25<sup>th</sup> EvalNet Meeting took place virtually, and included three main sessions. During two Regional Sessions, members developed initial plans for further work on gender equality and women's empowerment, and discussed an upcoming evaluation systems study, highlighting areas of particular interest. During the main plenary session, participants discussed how the COVID-19 pandemic is affecting their work programmes, and welcomed the COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition. Updates were provided on ongoing work on blended finance, and on dissemination of the evaluation criteria, approved in 2019. During three informal sessions, members exchanged experiences on: 1) The humanitarian, peace, and development nexus, 2) Climate change, and 3) Capacity development.

An informal summary of the Partnership Forum held on the 19 and 25 June 2020 with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) is provided in an annex.

**Contact:**

Megan Kennedy-Chouane, [megan.kennedy-chouane@oecd.org](mailto:megan.kennedy-chouane@oecd.org), +33 1.85.55.47.49

**JT03475614**

## Summary Record: 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation

*The meeting was held virtually via Zoom. Technical and capacity constraints related to the COVID-19 pandemic meant that simultaneous interpretation was not provided.*

### Day 1: 16 June 2020

#### Item 1. Regional Session

*This session was held twice, to allow for participants from different time zones. The summary below covers both discussions.*

#### Item 1a. Gender equality and women's empowerment

1. The purpose of the session was to identify priorities to improve the evaluation of efforts (both mainstreamed and targeted) to support gender equality and women's empowerment. Drawing on a light touch mapping, carried out by the Secretariat, Spain kicked off the discussion. Sonia Franco (Spain) described the synergies between human rights and gender equality, and gave an overview of the different evaluation approaches, including gender mainstreaming; gender responsive; human rights approach; feminist evaluation; and gender analysis. She described the persistently high levels of inequalities and highlighted that addressing these inequalities is a top political priority for Spain. She asked members to share experiences on three dimensions: integrating gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE); methods/tools; and suggestions for the next steps.
2. Jan Pettersson (EBA – Sweden) asked about the knowledge base on the effects of gender budgeting. The Chair invited AfDB to share on this topic, and Svetlana Negroustoueva (AfDB) highlighted that their work has identified persistent challenges, especially with building evidence. She described efforts to integrate gender into project evaluations, with mixed results. In addition, she described a gap in evidence of women's empowerment and gender equality in private sector operations, in particular.
3. Robert Christie (Australia) shared a major evaluation released last year on ending violence against women and girls. Santo Purello (Italy) described a list of activities they are doing to integrate GEWE concerns in evaluation practices, including a new publication. Pierre Tremblay (Canada) highlighted the importance of forming specialists on Gender and Evaluation. Cecilia De Decker (Belgium) suggested looking at gender as a specific issue or evaluation question, which allows the analysis to go deeper, rather than treating it as a crosscutting issue. Karen Rousseau (AFD) shared that they will publish an evaluation of gender mainstreaming in interventions financed by AFD in early 2021.
4. Masa Igarashi (UNEG Chair) highlighted cultural sensitivities and the importance of using a political economy type of approach. He stated that it is necessary to have an institutional policy for all programmes to mainstream gender equality. At FAO, the first gender equality evaluation led to the creation of such a policy. Lastly, he shared that UNEG has published several guidelines on gender and human rights, including "Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations".
5. The Secretariat, the Netherlands and Canada discussed how the criteria adaptation process addressed concerns around inclusion of gender as a specific criteria or consideration (rather than mainstreaming it systematically).
6. Rahul Malhotra (OECD) touched upon the wider debate about the usefulness of cross-cutting issues, including gender – as a concept and a practice – and asked if evaluation could produce evidence on the relative efficacy of mainstreaming, targeting and/or twin track approaches. Lisa Williams (OECD/GenderNet Secretariat) agreed with the importance of these questions and shared that there is a lively debate within GenderNet on the efficacy of mainstreaming gender. Eva Johansson (GenderNet Chair) welcomed the opportunity to collaborate, shared the current work priorities of GenderNet –

including developing guidance for development co-operation – and expressed her willingness to further share experiences especially around mainstreaming and other strategies.

7. Megan Kennedy-Chouane (OECD) shared that EvalNet and GenderNet have collaborated in the past and there was agreement that now would be a good time to renew the collaboration. Jenny Hedman (OECD/GenderNet Secretariat) suggested interest in digging deeper into intersectionality and pointed to synergies between the current work of GenderNet and EvalNet members. GenderNet is conducting a survey to understand evaluation of GEWE activities, and the development of a political economy approach on GEWE.

***Follow up action:***

- An EvalNet Working Group on Gender Equality was formed, with volunteer members from EC, Spain, AfDB, AFD, and Germany DEval. Members suggested this group should reach out to GenderNet to explore the creation of a joint task force.
- The Secretariat will look at how to include gender equality in the forthcoming criteria guidance and invite member’s feedback during workshops in July.
- The Secretariat will circulate previous EvalNet work to GenderNet, including the Evaluation Insights on [Mainstreaming Gender Equality: Emerging Evaluation Lessons](#).

**Item 1b. Evaluation systems**

8. The purpose of this session was to discuss the tools and benchmarks currently used to review evaluation systems, and to feed into plans for an evaluation systems study and the updating of the DAC Peer Review methodology and approach.

9. Rahul Malhotra (OECD) explained the role of peer reviews in monitoring and assessing evaluation systems via EvalNet as well as part of the DAC Peer Reviews. He described the ongoing process of revising the DAC Peer Review methodology and approach. The current framework includes two indicators on evaluation. Claudio Cerabino (OECD) presented the digital Development Co-operation Report Profiles, which include a section on evaluation systems (drawn from peer reviews). Megan Kennedy-Chouane (OECD) suggested that the upcoming evaluation systems study could cover in more depth some of the emerging issues discussed in EvalNet, such as coverage of gender equality in evaluation policies, real time evaluation, and resourcing evaluations. The Chair opened the discussion noting that evaluation systems are quite diverse and members’ levels of capacity vary widely. It is useful therefore to look at systems periodically to stay up to date as a network.

10. Natasha Adlešić Barba (Slovenia) gave the perspective from a new DAC donor, describing how the peer review helped set the foundations to strengthen the evaluation function. The Secretariat praised Slovenia for providing a management response to the peer review, which is considered best practice (and is done on a voluntary basis).

11. Patrick Empey (Ireland) stated that the peer review of Ireland highlighted how differently the three main ministries involved in official development assistance (ODA) handle evaluation (and the relative role of evaluation compared to ODA volumes). He also mentioned that where the unit is located has an effect on the focus, types of evaluation and reporting lines. Pierre Tremblay (Canada) mentioned that the bulk of Global Affairs Canada’s evaluations (75%) are decentralised, and not covered as well by Peer Reviews.

12. Robert Christie (Australia) suggested that it would be helpful for the study to support members to be able to talk about resources. Australia has tried cross-department evaluations but found that it did not work very well due to the differences in the nature of the work.

13. Wakana Kanikawa (Japan) shared that Japan recently underwent a peer review. She shared her impression that the peer reviews tend to focus more on the learning perspective than the accountability perspective. She suggested that accountability should receive more attention, as it is very important for

gaining public support and securing resources for ODA. She also remarked that Japan works closely with academia (ex: Japan Evaluation Society), which is a unique effort that should also be captured.

14. Cecilia De Decker (Belgium) suggested using the study as a benchmark to advocate for resources and to improve evaluation systems. She suggested the study address the tensions between learning and accountability, and described an approach for balancing these two goals by combining a mid-term evaluation focused on learning, with a final evaluation focused on accountability.

15. Wendy Asbeek Brusse (Netherlands) suggested looking at how different members have dealt with evaluation themes that cut across government, particularly on information management and how to overcome barriers to accessing materials (raw data, policy documents, evidence). She described bureaucratic impediments that prevent evaluations from accessing all of the material they need.

16. Seonyeon Shin (Korea) and Sven Olander (Sweden) agreed that the evaluation systems studies are very useful. Sigrid Breddy (Austria) described how they used peer review recommendations on evaluation to push other ministries to join in evaluating issues that cut across government, and described work on a strategic evaluation plan to capture such topics (e.g. climate change mitigation/adaptation).

17. Stephane Jacobzone (OECD/ Governance Directorate of the OECD) presented an OECD study on policy evaluation systems, covering 42 country evaluation functions in centres of government. He suggested it could be useful to better connect development evaluation with other evaluation systems, to support learning across government. The report will be launched soon: <http://www.oecd.org/gov/webinar-understanding-cross-country-practices-for-policy-evaluation.htm>. The Chair welcomed the suggestion and supported the idea of cross-government learning, mentioning as examples the use of joint evaluations with other ministries to take into account transboundary or cross-policy impacts.

18. Hans Lundgren (former OECD) shared that the evaluation systems studies are a unique and valuable contribution of the network, with the reports downloaded many times. He described some of the challenges in producing the 2016 report, particularly the sensitivities around making comparisons or rankings.

19. The poll of participants found the two topics of highest interest were evaluation resourcing (human and financial); and analysis of evaluation use, communication and uptake (what works to support learning from evaluation findings). There was also interest in analysis of trends in the system set up (reporting lines, independence, embedding, decentralised/centralised unit mandates), and analysis of accountability and use of evaluation in strategic decision-making (including with Parliament, broader governance).

#### ***Follow up actions***

- Members are encouraged to provide further suggestions to help shape the new systems study.
- The following members volunteered to be part of a working group to provide guidance on the study: Akua ARTHUR (AfDB), Jörg Faust and Sven Harten (DEval), Patrick EMPEY (Ireland), and Erla Hlin Hjálmarsdóttir (Iceland). Planning for the work will kick off end of 2020.

#### **Item 1c. Syntheses and evidence reviews**

20. Members discussed evaluation syntheses or evidence reviews they are conducting (or interested in conducting), with an eye to avoid duplication and identify potential topics for collaboration. Topics of interest included Afghanistan (country level synthesis); domestic resource mobilisation; women's empowerment and gender equality; and job creation through private sector development. Members agreed that there have been positive experiences with syntheses, and this should be a continued area of collaboration. Coherence and Afghanistan seemed to be the topics with the most interest. There was also interest in private sector interventions and job creation.

#### ***Follow up actions***

- Due to the limited time available for discussion of syntheses, the Chair encouraged members to share further thoughts via the Community Site.
- The Secretariat invited members to respond to an ongoing survey of evidence syntheses related to COVID-19, conducted by the Global COVID-19 Evaluation Coalition Secretariat in cooperation with DEval. DEval will analyse the information gathered to create an overview of review efforts, to support collaboration. The Secretariat will publish the aggregate information and any shared reviews on the Coalition website.

## **Item 2. Small Group Session. Humanitarian, peacebuilding and development nexus**

21. The purpose of this small group session was for members to share recent work and identify potential areas for further collaborative work related to evaluating peacebuilding, conflict prevention and humanitarian interventions. In particular, it was useful to share ideas on the application of the new evaluation criteria in these settings, as an input to the guidance EvalNet is developing.

22. Wendy Asbeek Brusse (Netherlands) presented IOB's "Less pretension more realism" evaluation, which investigates what the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs had achieved in peacebuilding and reconstruction. The evaluation examined the effectiveness of peacebuilding programmes, identified areas for improvement and made recommendations to the Government. The evaluation identified many areas for improvement. For example, it recommended that people who have context-specific knowledge/training lead peacebuilding dialogue sessions and that organizers must be aware of the potential negative effects of bringing together (former) rival groups.

23. Drawing on previous collaborative work with INCAF, Megan Kennedy-Chouane (OECD) flagged the disconnect between the micro level and the macro level of evaluations: with project level evaluations having positive results, while the countries' overall situation was deteriorating. Wendy Asbeek Brusse (Netherlands) responded highlighting the importance of sometimes using the regional lens and reinforced the importance of context-specific knowledge.

24. Sven Olander (Sweden) provided updates of Sweden's evaluation on peace building which covered 25 years of programmes. He defined it as a serious effort to look at the relevance, impact and sustainability of the interventions, and looked at gender equality. The findings showed that most projects had been successful to support the peace process but failed to target enough the root causes of these conflicts. Consequently, the question of how to target the root causes generated a big debate in SIDA.

25. Australia shared details of an evaluation that looked into engagement with conflict prevention and peacebuilding through diplomacy, aid, trade and security domains. It looks at the extent to which the types of policies in place, the processes, capabilities and resources enabled good practice in conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

26. AfDB shared an Evaluation of the AfDB Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa (2014-2019), which examined how the Bank could enhance the strategy, and provided lessons. ALNAP presented its strategy on improving the quality and accessibility of evaluative evidence, monitoring the performance of the humanitarian system, addressing key evidence gaps, and supporting system-wide learning.

27. INCAF was introduced. INCAF is a subsidiary body of the DAC. It is a forum to improve policy and programming responses, track results, and set the agenda for international engagement in fragile situations. It provides a clearinghouse for guidance on effective development cooperation in these settings. It also serves as an incubator for new thinking and practices on fragility, including through guidance on financing for stability, conflict prevention and peacebuilding, and effective engagement in fragile contexts.

## Day 2: 17 June 2020

### Item 3. Main Plenary Session

#### Item 3a. Opening

28. The Chair opened the meeting and confirmed approval of the Annotated Agenda for the 25<sup>th</sup> EvalNet Meeting [DCD/DAC/EV/A (2020)1], and the Summary Record of the 24<sup>th</sup> EvalNet Meeting [(DCD/DAC/EV/M(2020)2], which were both approved in advance via the written procedure. New participants introduced themselves briefly.

#### Item 3b. COVID-19 Pandemic: Discussion of joint work and strategic implications

29. David Heath (Canada) presented the Global COVID-19 Evaluation Coalition, a collaborative project made up of evaluation units from EvalNet, partner countries, United Nations organisations, and multilateral banks. He described how the Global Coalition grew out of a series of discussions hosted by Global Affairs Canada and the OECD Secretariat in the spring of 2020, and is loosely modelled after the collaborative evaluation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, and the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition. The aim is to support a unified coordination effort (across EvalNet, UNEG and ECG members) for more and better evaluation of the COVID-19 response and recovery efforts.

30. The Coalition participants have taken a phased and modular approach, feeding in evidence to inform the ongoing response, and eventually assessing effectiveness and impact. A variety of outputs will build on collective and individual evaluations around a shared evaluation framework, which will include mapping the responses; mapping the available evidence and ongoing studies; and, agreeing on relevant evaluation questions to facilitate syntheses. Canada shared that a first synthesis of evaluation findings – on food security – was produced following a rapid evidence review, with input from various Coalition participants, including UNEG and EvalNet members. The evaluation team presented the note to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Canada and shared it at a meeting with other development ministers. This was a useful opportunity to feed insights from evaluation into ongoing decision-making processes. Coalition participants are now developing a second note, on gender equality in education.

31. EvalNet members welcomed the initiative and discussed priorities and next steps. There was consensus that this is a useful initiative and that the Secretariat should continue to work on this topic and to support interested members and the co-ordination of the Coalition. EvalNet members supported the proposed light governance structure for the coalition with a small core group of participants to drive the work forward and increased capacity in the Secretariat to support the work.

32. Participants also shared their own priorities for evaluating the COVID response and recovery, and areas of interest:

- The AIIB is interested in looking at the extent to which the most vulnerable populations are being reached.
- UNEG is looking at options for coordinating data collection and evaluation at the country level, to avoid over-burdening partners with multiple evaluation requests.
- The EC suggested focusing on health sector support and understanding whether the initial response is on the right track. They also have a new Evaluation in Crisis initiative, which shares lessons learned. The EC would like to contribute to the Coalition effort.
- AfDB is interested in looking at the collective response at the country level, and the potential of negative impacts that focusing too much on COVID-19 may have on other development challenges.
- Germany is also interested in looking at externalities and opportunity costs of the COVID-19 responses that shifted funds from existing programmes, as well as the quality of new COVID-19

specific support. There are also interesting questions related to the impacts on civil rights and governance.

- Japan is interested in a country case study, exploring what went well in addition to what went wrong, including how countries learned from previous pandemics and strengthened their systems.
- Norway and Denmark are interested in real-time evaluations and both Governments are funding vaccine development, a potential topic for future evaluation.

### **Item 3c. EvalNet Business and Current Work**

33. This session provided a series of updates for information and discussion.

#### **Evaluation capacity development**

34. Sven Olander (Sweden), the EvalNet focal point on evaluation capacity development (ECD) gave a brief update on the Global Evaluation Initiative, based on a written update [Room Document 3c]. This is a global evaluation initiative to support ECD. It is an inclusive partnership initiative to support countries in strengthening national evaluation capacities that leverage networks that already existed. The pandemic highlighted weaknesses in monitoring and evaluation across many governments, and there is a growing demand for support. The initiative prioritizes four levels of support: enabling environment, organisational capacity, individual capacity, and technical knowledge. The GEI has raised USD 20 million to date and will be operational by September. The next step is a co-creation workshop to develop further the theory of change and results framework.

#### **Evaluating blended finance**

35. The Co-ordination Group (Denmark, Germany, Norway and the Secretariat) updated members on the Working Group on Evaluating Blended Finance. Germany highlighted how the Group has been contributing to other work in the field including several initiatives on impact (OECD impact initiative, Tri Hita Karana Roadmap for Blended Finance). The status of current work streams was shared: 1) definition of blended finance key terms and concepts (draft paper); 2) financial and development additionality (draft paper); 3) how to evaluate different blended finance instruments (drafting, to be finalised 2021). A series of upcoming events will disseminate the findings of the papers and support further reflection.

#### **Secretariat update**

36. The Secretariat provided a brief update on ongoing work, including various events and materials to disseminate the new evaluation criteria definitions and principles (approved by EvalNet in November 2019), and the development of guidance on how to use the criteria. The Secretariat confirmed that reception to the new definitions has been positive and that there is good uptake of the new criteria. The Secretariat invited members to give input on the draft guidance during workshops in July.

37. Jorge Moreira da Silva (OECD/DCD Director) welcomed the COVID-19 Coalition and suggested that this valuable global effort could be a model or source of inspiration for other evaluation topics. He provided an overview of work within the Development Co-operation Directorate to respond to the pandemic with data collection, policy analysis, support for coordination and sharing of information via an OECD-wide digital hub. He also highlighted work to look at all forms of financing and the impacts of the pandemic in fragile contexts. He shared that evaluation is a priority in the new 2021-22 OECD DAC programme of work and budget (PWB). He sees evaluation not just as a work stream but also influencing all the five policy challenges identified.

38. In closing, the Director – and the Network – thanked Per Bastøe for his leadership of the network. He highlighted the critical contribution Per has made to advancing the EvalNet agenda, in particular in the adaptation of the evaluation criteria.

39. The Secretariat introduced Gabriela Boiteux-Pilna (Czech Republic) who will serve as the DAC Facilitator for EvalNet, ensuring two-way communication with the DAC, and two new staff, Nelly Dubarry (Assistant) and Alison Pollard (Policy Analyst).

#### **Designation of EvalNet Bureau**

40. The Secretariat confirmed the EvalNet Bureau, selected by written procedure: Wendy Asbeek Brusse (Netherlands) as Chair; Robert Christie (Australia) as vice-chair; and continuation of Jörg Faust of Germany as vice-chair.

#### **Item 4. Regional Session**

*This session repeated Item 1 and is included in the summary of that session.*

### **Day 3: 18 June 2020**

#### **Item 5. Small Group Session: Climate change**

41. DEval and the DAC Network on Environment and Development Co-operation (EnviroNet) updated members on recent work on resilience, describing the work to develop guidance. Jörg Faust (DEval) described work with the Green Climate Fund to produce a first evidence gap map and a heat map on international climate change adaptation. He encouraged members to share if anyone has plans to conduct similar work so that they can join efforts. Henning Nøhr (Denmark) shared that the theory of change around climate adaptation can be very challenging and expressed interest in working on this topic.

42. Jan Pettersson (Sweden, EBA) presented a study involving 10 cases studies evaluating a Swedish climate change initiative spread across 17 multilateral funds; the focus is on long-term effects and sustainability. Tania Rajadel (EIB) shared that EIB has big ambitions in terms of climate, and there is a current focus on energy efficiency. They are also conducting an evidence gap map for diagnostic purposes.

43. Several members, including Sweden, Germany, AfDB, Denmark, the Netherlands, Finland, Ireland, and Korea, expressed interest in joint work to better understand where there is evidence that is not being used (where evidence needs to be better communicated), where evidence is lacking, etc.

#### **Item 6. Small Group Session: Capacity development**

44. During this informal session, members shared experiences, including new work from the IMF and several evaluations that have been carried out recently. The Independent Evaluation Office of the IMF is scoping an evaluation of the IMF's Capacity Development work. The IEO's previous full evaluation of this topic was in 2005, with an Update published in 2014. Interested members were invited to share their experiences or contact Michael Kell (IEO, IMF) directly.

*A Partnership Forum with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) was held in conjunction with the EvalNet Meeting. An informal summary is provided as an annex to this summary record.*

## ANNEX 1



## Informal Summary report on the UNEG-EvalNet Partnership Forum

United Nations Evaluation Group – OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation  
Virtual Joint Meetings  
19 June 2020 and 25 June 2020

### Introduction

In line with the UNEG Partnership Strategy<sup>1</sup>, the UNEG and the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation collaborate on various topics, including a Joint Task Team on Peer Reviews, and through joint evaluations carried out by members. In order to consolidate the relationship between the two networks, a small working group of UNEG, together with the EvalNet Secretariat, organized a first Partnership Forum, held virtually in June 2020.

The purpose of this Partnership Forum was to provide an opportunity for members of to get to know one another, to build relationships, and to work together to advance evaluation policy and practice. The forum was an opportunity to advance the common objectives of both groups, namely to enhance the evaluation community's professionalism, capacity, and collaboration with the aim of evaluating, and supporting achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

### Forum Outline

The Partnership Forum took place virtually on Friday 19 and Thursday 25 June 2020, divided into two Plenary Sessions and 13 *Food for Thought* slots, where participants could informally share knowledge and ideas regarding their current work.

The Forum covered a variety of topics, such as data visualization and methodological tools for evaluation; discussions on opportunities, challenges, and recommendations for improvement in joint evaluations and collaboration between UNEG and EvalNet; evaluation in fragile or vulnerable contexts; evaluation strategies under the current COVID-19 pandemic; and reflections on institutionalized evaluation practices.

The **First Plenary** focused on how to work together for both learning and accountability, across a range of issues related to bilateral funding, core funding, and multi-donor funding arrangements. Its purpose was to explore how we can work together more effectively as evaluation units representing the DAC and UN institutions, for both learning and accountability, across a range of issues related to bilateral funding, core funding, and multi-donor funding arrangements.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEG Principles of Working Together 2019. <http://www.uneval.org/document/download/3342>

The **Second Plenary** was a space to explore implications of the COVID-19 outbreak. Guest speaker Professor **Ruth Stewart** shared her perspective on the current COVID-19 situation, use of evidence, and appetite for the application of evidence in responding to this crisis in South Africa and from other perspectives in Africa. She emphasized the complexity and interconnectivity of different sectors in the current crisis. She suggested that as an evaluation community, we should think about what we can do to support analysis and understanding across sectors (using a braid/plate as a metaphor). She discussed the importance of trust between the evidence producing community and the policymakers who use that evidence. Where trust and relationships are well established, we see a more effective response.

Professor Stewart mentioned three possible lessons for the evaluation community (using a jigsaw puzzle piece as visual aid):

1. Investing in institutions and structures; supporting the development of these structures and the cycle of evidence generation as a whole.
2. Not working in isolation: We need to think about interconnections and build effective and trusted communities. Units and sectors working in isolation slow down the response. We also cannot rely on individual studies but have to use different pieces of individual evidence generated to see the whole picture.
3. Thinking about the long game: Expecting not only a second, but also possibly a third and fourth wave of the virus, Ruth stresses that we should think not only about the immediate needs, but also the long term. As evaluation community, we have to think about getting evidence that helps to mitigate the long-term effects.

During the discussion, participants shared further reflections on supporting evidence use and uptake, in the current context. The session ended with participants welcoming the COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition and committing to work together to advance the collaborative effort evaluating the COVID-19 response and recovery efforts.

The **Food for Thought sessions** were diverse and offered to participants the opportunity to engage according to their own needs and interests. The list of sessions can be found below in Table 1.

### Food for Thought Sessions

Date	Sessions	Organisation
19 June Morning sessions	1. 'Minimum Costs of a Healthy Diet' as a tool in planning agricultural development	The Netherlands, IOB (Policy and Operations Evaluation Department)
	2. Going visual in a virtual world: how visualization is bringing greater engagement to evaluation discussions	WFP
	3. Adapting for Change – Country Strategy Approach in Fragile Contexts	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
19 June Afternoon	4. Evaluation in Crisis - an EC/DG DEVCO initiative	EU DG DEVCO / Evaluation Support Service

sessions	5. Financing Models for Evaluation	UN-Habitat
	6. Evaluation in Contexts of Fragility, Conflict and Violence including situations of pandemics	EU DG DEVCO / Evaluation Support Service
	7. Blended Finance in-between development goals and financial sustainability: how do we get the balance right? Findings and recommendations from a DEval evaluation	DEval
25 June	8. Evaluation of the Swedish Climate Change Initiative	Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA)
Afternoon sessions	9. Punching above its weight - Evaluation of Finnish Development Policy Influencing Activities in Multilateral Organisations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
(No morning sessions on that day)	10. Supporting decentralized evaluations on measuring the response to the COVID-19 pandemic	ILO
	11. Introducing the work of the UNEG Interest Group on Evaluation Method	FAO and UNCDF
	12. Reflections on racism for the evaluation community	OECD
	13. Re-thinking the role of secondary data and opportunities for remote data collection when evaluators do not have the luxury of face-to-face data collection – Lessons from COVID-19 so far	WFP