

**Unclassified**

**English - Or. English**

12 April 2024

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

## **DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

### **Summary Record of the 28th Meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

20-21 June 2022, OECD Conference Centre

Members approved this draft summary record at EvalNet's 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting, with one minor edit to Para 12. It is now issued as FINAL.

The 28<sup>th</sup> EvalNet meeting was held in a hybrid format (with both in-person and virtual participation), due to the ongoing pandemic and related travel restrictions. Hybrid sessions were open to all registered staff from participating EvalNet units/departments, and guests by invitation. The COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition met on the afternoon of 21 June 2022.

A side event of the DAC Community of Practice on Poverty and Inequalities was held on 22-24 June 2022; a summary of that event was provided separately by the Community of Practice.

Megan Kennedy-Chouane, MeganGrace.KENNEDY-CHOUANE@oecd.org + (33-1) 85 55 47 49

**JT03541595**

## Summary Record of the 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation

*This meeting was held in a hybrid format (with both in-person and virtual participation), due to the ongoing pandemic and travel restrictions. Interpretation French/English was provided for all formal sessions.*

**20 June 2022**

### Introduction: What does it mean to be part of EvalNet?

1. Chair Jörg Faust (Germany) welcomed members. Megan Kennedy-Chouane (OECD) followed with a presentation on EvalNet, describing the definition of evaluation as a systemic and objective assessment of an intervention, programme, or policy, its implementation, and its results and noting the importance of evaluations for decision-making, learning, and accountability. She introduced the composition of EvalNet, the Chairs and Vice Chairs (Romana Tedeschi and Isabelle Mercier), and the composition and role of the Secretariat team. She shared information about how the network serves as a forum for exchange, develops norms and tools, analyses and shares development evidence, promotes collaboration, and supports transparency. She described the current programme of work and budget, and noted the key norms and standards of the network including the DAC Quality Standards for Evaluation, and evaluation criteria.
2. Gabriella Boiteux-Pilna (DAC facilitator, Czech Republic) explained the role of the two facilitators serving as a bridge between EvalNet and the Development Assistance Committee (DAC).
3. Ludhiya Johnson (OECD) demonstrated to members how to use the [DAC Evaluation Resource Centre \(DEReC\)](#) to access numerous reports and evaluation plans shared by EvalNet members.
4. During the discussion, Denmark welcomed the wealth of evaluations available on DEReC, and encouraged further discussion of how to bridge evaluations and other policy areas, including how to improve the use of evaluation for better policymaking. Sweden added that evaluation functions can be organised in many ways, and it is useful to hear about the different experiences of the variety of organisations in EvalNet. Finland and USAID also noted the important contributions of EvalNet for their respective organisations.
5. Wakana Kanikawa (Japan MFA) presented the experience of Japan as a long-time active member of EvalNet. She noted the value of EvalNet, especially its role in building shared international norms, principles, and standards, offering mutual learning opportunities, and ensuring collaboration with members. Tom Hennessy (Ireland) described how Ireland has benefited from EvalNet, noting that EvalNet offers an opportunity for networking and sharing lessons, and plays a role in setting standards, norms, principles, and criteria of evaluation, which are important reference points. It offers the opportunity to work together against common challenges, for example through the [COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition](#).
6. Oscar A. Garcia (UNDP) noted that the UNDP is implementing a grading system based on DAC evaluation criteria – demonstrating the usefulness of this tool beyond the DAC. The UNDP has worked on setting guidance and DAC-United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) peer reviews of UN evaluation systems are useful to ensure evaluation units of UN development agencies are up to date. Peer reviews are always mutual learning exercises.
7. Rahul Malhotra (OECD) highlighted the focus of the network on setting norms and standards and welcomed the ways the network is stepping up to respond to policy priorities. He highlighted two

examples: the COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition started in 2020, and the work on Afghanistan (2021), which display the ability of the network to identify and focus on priorities and remain relevant.

8. The Chair noted that there are challenges with the capacity of policymakers to absorb information and it is essential to ensure that evaluations are being used. He added that another challenge relates to the quality of evaluations themselves, particularly when resources are limited.

### **Item 1. Opening Session and EvalNet Work Updates**

9. Members approved the Annotated Agenda for the 28th Meeting without amendment and the following new members presented themselves:

- Austria: Mr Michael MILOSITS
- United States (USAID): Ms Julie CHEN
- Finland : Ms Ulla JÄRVELÄ-SEPPINEN
- Hungary: Ms Zita NAGY
- Japan: Mr Shigeki FURUTA
- Luxembourg: Mr Benjamin MACKAY
- Portugal: Mr Pedro ABREU
- Czech Republic: Mr Josef ORIŠKO
- Sweden: Ms Lena JOHANSSON DE CHÂTEAU
- Asian Development Bank (ADB): Mr Manny (Emmanuel) JIMENEZ
- UNDP Independent Evaluation Office & UNEG rep: Mr Oscar A. GARCIA

10. Members provided updates on ongoing work.

- Winston Allen (USAID) shared the COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition’s upcoming work on country-led evaluations and a strategic joint evaluation.
- Germany shared ideas on Tracking evaluation recommendations and monitoring follow-up actions and invited interested members to reach out.
- Oscar A. Garcia (UNDP) presented a “Concept Note for Joint UN-wide Syntheses of Evidence of SDGs’ Achievements in Peace, People, Prosperity, Planet and Partnerships”. Members expressed generally positive interest and agreed that the Bureau will follow up.
- GenderNet – EvalNet Joint Working Group: Under the guidance of the Working Group (comprised of Australia, Canada, Belgium, Germany (Deval), Germany (GIZ), France, Spain, European Commission, UNDP, Sweden (EBA)), the Secretariat has commissioned work exploring the use of the evaluation criteria and Human Rights & Gender Equality.
- The Secretariat updated members on the EvalNet-INCAF Joint Temporary Task Team on Afghanistan, including three workstreams currently underway. The EvalNet study will explore underlying drivers of evaluation use and learning in crisis settings. It is being conducted by consultants affiliated with the Afghan Evaluation Society, guided by a small Reference Group made up of EvalNet and INCAF members together with external experts.
- Piper Hart (OECD) presented emerging findings from the 2022 Review of Evaluation Systems and described the web-based profiles that will be created for each member.

## Item 2. Old and new impact debates

11. This session explored a recent renewed interest in the use of rigorous impact evaluation methods as well as the ongoing discussion about evaluation and its role in both evaluating and influencing transformational change. Megan Kennedy-Chouane (OECD) and Mayanka Vij (OECD) kicked off the session by highlighting that the evaluation criteria provided an opportunity to revisit debates on the role of evaluation in transformational change and provided a short history of EvalNet’s past work on impact evaluation.

12. Marie Gaarder (3ie) discussed the current evidence landscape and introduced the 3ie Development Evidence Portal, a resource that brings together rigorous evidence from evaluations in international development. The tool allows for identifying the changes in evaluation trends and areas where there is ample evidence (such as health) or gaps. Some sectors that receive a significant portion of development assistance are subject to a limited number of impact evaluations. Moreover, the presentation highlighted that not all “evidence gaps” can be filled due to the constantly changing context.

13. Léa Macias (AFD, France) described how AFD to has responded to the increasing demand for demonstrating impact. While randomised control trials (RCTs) are the most recognised response to this challenge, she highlighted the importance of developing and using a variety of methods of impact assessment that fit with the context of each intervention (timing, coverage, available resources, etc.). She presented four examples of AFD’s work in impact evaluation: Veolia in Uvira (DRC) on improving infrastructure and cholera prevention, Water access in Kinshasa (DRC), qualitative impact evaluation of the PILAEP 2 project and qualitative impact of rural electrification (Benin).

14. Zlata Bruckauf (UNICEF) presented the UNICEF Strategy to evaluate impact (2022-2025), which responds to demands for better evidence on impacts. The policy encourages a greater focus on outcomes and impacts as well as learning to ensure that programmes can answer questions about “what works?”, “why?”, “for whom?” and “at what cost?”. The strategy also identified current challenges such as data limitations, high costs, limited use of robust methods, etc. Currently, only 6% of evaluations at UNICEF are impact evaluations. The immediate priorities are the institutionalisation of impact evaluations (new policy forthcoming in 2023), demonstrating the feasibility of harmonised multi-county approaches, testing more efficient methods, developing alternative sources of data for humanitarian evaluations, and stimulating learning on theory-based approaches.

15. Martin Bruder and Marion Krämer (DEval, Germany) presented a study of rigorous impact evaluation (RIE) in German development co-operation. The research project was set up in 2018 because RIE was seen as important to increase development effectiveness, little knowledge existed about RIE in German development co-operation and there was a perception that previous attempts to strengthen RIE had not worked. The research analysed “What is the status quo?”, “What are the barriers?” and “What potential solutions exist?” using surveys, interviews, document analysis, and reviews. Despite an increasing implementation of RIEs, they concluded that the number remains low compared to German ODA volumes with no systemic approach or strategy. The research also found that the results of RIE are sometimes used at the project level, but the global RIE evidence base is rarely used. The study makes suggestions for awareness raising, capacity development and strategic planning for actors involved in development co-operation including governmental departments, public research, evaluation institutes, implementing agencies, NGOs, and other actors.

16. Manny Jimenez (ADB) highlighted the importance of ensuring that policymakers want the evidence we produce, and the importance of supporting platforms such as 3ie, that are making evaluations accessible as a public good. He also emphasised the importance of creating the right incentives, because evaluators are often judged by the number of evaluations produced and not their influence on development co-operation. He concluded by noting the importance of choosing the right tools to evaluate risky investments and stated that most current tools are not risk-sensitive. The goal should be to make staff accountable for projects and institutions accountable for portfolios to avoid being risk averse.

17. Peter van der Knaap (Netherlands) commented on the importance of focusing on both portfolio and project-level evaluations. He also highlighted the complementarity between rigorous impact evaluation and utilisation evaluation.

18. Amanda Glassman (CGD) emphasised the value of impact evaluations in shaping cost-efficient programmes. She noted that the limitations to the use of evidence are being addressed in new ways in the field and announced that CGD will share a policy paper summarising recent innovations in conducting rigorous impact evaluations.

19. Cécilia De Decker (Belgium) noted that Belgium is in the process of drawing lessons from five impact evaluations of the Belgian government. She noted that there is a lack of resources to cover all sectors with a similar level of coverage in the health sector. She described how the high costs of impact evaluations make it difficult to convince donors to support them.

20. During the discussion, the World Bank emphasised the important public good value of the collection of resources that 3ie has gathered. They expressed the hope that all members have agreed on the common premise of which methods are better suited for causal inferences including the use of experiments and quasi-experiments, with design-based controls or statistical controls for evaluating effectiveness. However, it is also important to consider a broad set of methodologies when experimental approaches can't be used. Finally, they noted that there are developments in methodologies and data science that should be explored (for example geospatial data, machine learning, etc.). Germany agreed on the importance of adjusting methods according to the questions that need to be answered. They also noted the importance of using theory-based methodologies. Denmark further supported this position, stating that the starting point must be to define what we want to learn, and then choose a method accordingly.

21. The Chair wrapped up the session by framing the collection of impact evaluation as a public good. He also noted that institutional budgetary engineering is observable as culture change when you change budget policies. As such, he noted the importance of exchanging lessons.

22. Megan Kennedy-Chouane (OECD) invited in-person participants to join one of the informal meetings on the topic of their choice: impact evaluation, Climate Crisis Working Group, the evaluation system study, and the 5Ps synthesis of the UNDP. During the informal discussion, the Climate Crisis Working Group identified topics of mutual interest, which will be used to develop a draft work plan.

## 21 June 2022

### EvalNet Helpdesk: Solving problems together

23. The Secretariat introduced the EvalNet Helpdesk and the “wise crowds” facilitation tool to help solve common challenges that members face. Three participant questions were selected based on a pre-meeting survey, and participants identified possible solutions.

Question 1. How do you design your annual evaluation plan – what are the criteria used in terms of coverage of the policy portfolio and the assessment of need that should be used?

- In response, the African Development Bank, Austria, and the Czech Republic highlighted the importance of developing a consultation mechanism to ensure that all important stakeholders are included. Belgium also noted that finding evidence gaps through the analysis of budgets is important to avoid leaving any significant investments not evaluated.

Question 2. How can we deal with consultants that provide poor-quality work?

- The AIIB noted the importance of redefining the role of consultants in giving input, not output. The Islamic Development Bank and Switzerland noted the importance of the hiring process including an adequate interview process to choose consultants.

Question 3. Should we have a rating or score on each evaluation criteria? If so, how do we do the scoring and how would you call each category?

- On the issue of adding a score/rate for each evaluation criteria, the members had divergent opinions on the subject. Some had a structured scheme to deal with this issue while others viewed this type of rating scheme as a potential limit to important dialogue during the evaluation exercise.

Question 4. What works better than long reports?

- On the topic of communicating long reports, the participants suggested a wide variety of existing or potential avenues. Korea shared its practice of making video summaries of evaluation results. BEI encouraged writing in a message-driven way and imposing certain length limits to executive summaries as well as exploring slide documents.

### Item 3. Advocating for and managing evaluation systems in the current context

24. Jessica Vince and Jennifer Stuttle (UK) shared the current challenges in FCDO, including sustained turbulence with COVID-19 and geopolitical events combined with the challenge of building an evaluation system in a new organisation. They noted that the demand for evaluations across the FCDO is patchy and they have a decentralised evaluation system with a small number of broad, strategic evaluations. The main goal they put forward is to “advance and strengthen the practice, quality and use of evaluation so that FCDO’s strategy, policy, and programming are more coherent, relevant, efficient, and effective and have greater impact.” To achieve these objectives, they note that it is essential to take a system perspective, understand the internal politics, and leverage evaluation champions.

25. Responding to members’ questions, Vince and Stuttle noted the value of evaluation champions. From their experiences, an effective leader connects directly with the decision-making committee and builds accountability for listening to evaluation.

26. Isabelle Mercier (Global Affairs Canada) shared her unit’s experience in recent reforms that took away the requirements for comprehensive reviews every five years allowing more flexible and useful evaluations. While they still conduct broad evaluations, they can also lead rapid reviews and short studies. They currently are focusing on producing shorter reports that are targeted at decision-makers, which has increased use. She also noted an increased demand and interest in learning which adds an additional burden on evaluation units. To lighten the burden, Global Affairs Canada made the decision of splitting the evaluation office and creating a division on *Learning support* which included experts in communication.

27. Responding to a question on convincing evaluators to change the design and length of reports, Mercier noted that evaluators became open to the changes when they saw the value. Evaluators do still write long reports, but shorter reports are produced as a communication product.

28. Tonka Eibs (Austrian Development Bank) presented the rollout of their evaluation policy released in 2019. She started by noting that due to the fragmentation of the Austrian Development Cooperation, the policy aimed to build ownership for all actors involved. The policy provided the first step, and this has been taken up with further modules including guidelines for programme and project evaluations. She presented ongoing efforts to promote inter-ministerial exchange and capacity development on evaluation, performing joint evaluations, and ensuring the use of evaluation results.

29. Oscar A. Garcia (UNDP) presented a strategy for the evaluation function in UNDP, which includes a theory of change for added influence. The office was mandated to conduct thematic evaluations with full coverage of country offices. They also developed a performance rating system that assesses how country offices reach their objectives, particularly at the outcome level, and their pilot initiative included 12 country evaluations in 2021. He noted that the process of quantifying performance data contributed to improving coherence and started a conversation about learning.

30. Commenting on the UNDP presentation, the FCDO highlighted the importance of context, which makes a unified rating risky. The World Bank noted the importance of considering how evaluation can be politicised within an institution.

#### **Item 4. Other Business and Closing session**

31. Daniel Jacobo Orea (Spain) shared their ongoing experience with developing an online database of all evaluations undertaken by all Spanish development actors. The dashboard provides a coherent picture of the funds allocated, evaluations status, sectors covered, and actors involved by partner countries. The platform aims to create one umbrella for planning, evaluating, and monitoring, making information available to citizens and parliament. Having all relevant information in one place will ease the analysis process and facilitate the biannual planning process.

32. The Chair highlighted the rich diversity in experiences that different organisations brought to the meeting and welcomed the learning taking place within the network. He encouraged members to continue thinking about how to create effective overall evaluation frameworks. He invited everyone to the COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition meeting and reminded them about the Joint sessions with the Community of Practice on Poverty and Inequalities on 22 and 24 June 2022.

### Meeting of the COVID-19 Global Evaluation Coalition

33. Jenna Smith-Kouassi (OECD) introduced the Coalition and described how participants are convening, communicating, coordinating, and collaborating. The Coalition is a collaborative effort to increase the reach and influence of evaluations that was formally launched at the joint session of UNEG and EvalNet in June 2020. It is comprised of the central or independent evaluation units of countries (DAC and non-DAC members), UN agencies, and multilateral institutions. She highlighted that the Coalition provides credible evaluative evidence on both the direct health responses and efforts to mitigate the secondary socio-economic impacts of COVID-19. The Coalition operates through voluntary efforts from participants and is complementary to their own evaluation efforts.

34. Jenna Smith-Kouassi highlighted some key achievements of the Coalition including growing to 66 participants (33 bilateral and 33 multilateral organisations), conducting the [Joint Evaluation of the Protection of Rights of Refugees during the COVID-19 Pandemic](#), publishing a synthesis report on the development and humanitarian actors' COVID-19 response and recovery effort, facilitating four peer learning sessions and two planning workshops, and launching phase two of the Strategic Joint Evaluation.

35. David Ryder Smith (UNHCR) presented his experiences and lessons from one of the key initiatives led under the auspices of the Coalition, the Joint Evaluation of the Protection of Rights of Refugees. He noted that the Coalition provided an opportunity to jointly address critical issues – in this case how refugees and protected people were affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and response. He explained that after confirming the interest of different actors, an evaluation group was convened, and then a reference group was formed with all key constituents: government, inter-governmental organisations, NGOs, academia, refugee-led organisations, and others. The evaluation was focused on three objectives: to ascertain the coherence and coverage of refugee rights promotion and incorporation into international cooperation in the context of national COVID-19 responses; to determine the effectiveness of the international response; and to identify good practices and lessons

36. David Ryder Smith shared some key findings and recommendations and noted that the full report will be launched on 8 July 2022. The recommendations included better promoting and upholding international refugee and human rights law; strengthening the global compact on refugees (GCR) as a basis for co-operation and responsibility sharing; improving information flows; and improving in-person protection services. The speaker also described how the evaluation design – including the reference group, regional launch events and a social media campaign – was set up to encourage the use of the findings.

37. A participant from DEval asked about the experience of working with Colombia and Uganda and potential key takeaways for approaching national governments. David Ryder Smith (UNHCR) noted that both these countries have strong and effective evaluation platforms that supported the work. On dissemination, he noted that the Coalition facilitated the process and allowed to share costs and responsibilities of different tasks associated within an overarching communication plan.

38. Susanna Morrison Metois (ALNAP) explained that they participated in the management group of the joint evaluation on the protection of refugee rights mainly because when individual agencies evaluate their own mandate the findings are not widely applicable. As such, this type of joint evaluation shows the usefulness of the Coalition in allowing to make the best use of every agency's own expertise and draw broader findings. ALNAP plans on using this joint evaluation as a model for dialogue and recommends conducting joint evaluations.

39. Natalia Kryg (EBRD) presented the rapid assessment of EBRD's response to the COVID-19 crisis. The EBRD was the first IFI to approve a tailored Covid-19 response package, a solidarity package comprised of both new and reallocated financing focused on existing private sector clients. The presentation touched on key lessons from the assessment, including what worked well, what may be improved, and what needs to be addressed moving forward. The presentation also demonstrated how the Coalition supported the study – notably, through the provision of early insights on methodology, streamlined access to data and information, a cross-institutional platform for knowledge sharing, and an ongoing source of knowledge in a fast-changing environment.

## Forward-looking discussion

40. Jos Vaessen (GEI) introduced the three evaluations led by evaluation units of partner countries – a Coalition initiative led in partnership by GEI and the OECD. He highlighted the benefits of a collaborative approach to evaluations, which can help reduce fragmentation. He noted that the main objective is to have authorities of partner countries design and conduct useful evaluations that feed into accountability and decision-making processes. In addition, the exercise will help strengthen national systems. The terms of reference are close to completion in Burkina Faso, Ghana, and Malawi. He thanked participants for their support and noted that further resources are needed, encouraging participants to actively engage with these evaluations and provide funding.

41. Each partner country presented the evaluation they are leading.

- Nana Opare-Djan (NDPC) Ghana presented a proposal for an evaluation of the Ghana Cares programme, which aimed to stabilize the economy (mostly prices, food security, etc.) in the short term. The main objectives are to support a more effective approach to evaluation, generate lessons and good practices, and share information focusing on the criteria of relevance and effectiveness to evaluate the programmes.
- Kasem Alhaeik (OECD) presented the country-led evaluation on behalf of the Ministry of Finance & Economy of Burkina Faso. The evaluation focuses on the national response plan to the COVID-19 pandemic, which included five components: the health response, management of public liberties and coordination of community engagement, management of economic and social consequences, management of humanitarian assistance, and management of crisis communication. The terms of reference are being finalised and Coalition participants are asked to signal their support for the work.
- Martin Mwale (Malawi) presented the Malawi country-led evaluation that will look at the urban poor cash-transfers initiative, which took place in the country during the pandemic. The evaluation will look at how these transfers affected the welfare of beneficiaries, with a focus on unintended effects, including links to domestic violence, food insecurity, and the labour market. The evaluation will use mixed methods and its main audience are ministries that were responsible for the initiative.
- Monzur Hossain (Bangladesh) shared initial ideas for a country-led evaluation in Bangladesh. He noted that a national evaluation forum was created with high-level participants, including secretaries of ministries, think tanks, and private sector actors that can inform public policy decisions. He also noted that the team is in the early process of preparing a terms of reference and determining the exact topic of the evaluation. The partners are still working on determining which sector and specific government initiative will be evaluated.

42. Coalition participants were asked to briefly share how they would contribute to existing and future initiatives of the Coalition, including the provision of data and support (financial/in-kind) for the strategic joint evaluation, support for country-led evaluations, and participation in working groups and other joint evaluative efforts. See summary in the table below.

43. John Lavis ([Global Commission on Evidence](#)) presented on the demand for evidence in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond. He introduced the [COVID-19 Evidence Network to support Decision-making \(COVID-END\)](#), which provides an inventory of evidence syntheses, including studies of vaccine rollouts and efficacy, and crisis management. He also highlighted the main priorities identified by the evidence commission report, notably strengthening national evidence support systems, enhancing and leveraging the global evidence architecture, and engaging citizen leaders in putting evidence at the centre of everyday efforts of governments.

44. Answering a question from the World Bank on evidence uptake in low-income countries, Lavis noted that the commission has supported stakeholders in low-income countries and conducted surveys on

what drives evidence uptake. The group's work is designed to reflect local values, political factors, etc. He noted that much of the COVID-19 research was funded by national entities interested primarily in clinical research. There are relatively few syntheses of COVID-related research, with a predominance of clinical and a lot of low-quality evidence.

45. Asked by the USA about bridging the gap between evidence and local stakeholders, Lavis noted that it is critical to involve people from affected communities in research including syntheses. Some examples from this work included involving single mums, tractor drivers, and other groups in the work, which had profound impacts on how they thought about evidence. Moreover, he noted the importance of context when communicating evidence, suggesting it is essential to consider the similarities and differences across systems and take them into account when interpreting evidence from other contexts. He concluded that their model encourages timely, demand-driven, context-sensitive evidence which focuses on equity and ensures bridging national and global evidence.

46. Megan Kennedy-Chouane (OECD) thanked John Lavis and all Coalition participants, committing that the secretariat would follow up with Coalition participants about future work.

**Table: Commitments and action points**

47. In a tour de table participants highlighted the following next steps.

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Action points</b>
European Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to the strategic joint evaluation (including the provision of data)</li> </ul>
Belgium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to the country-led evaluation of Burkina Faso</li> </ul>
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Join the reference group, provide technical support, and coordinate efforts for the strategic joint evaluation</li> <li>Potentially provide financial support for a country-led evaluation</li> </ul>
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to the working group on vaccines</li> <li>Confirm potential engagement with a country-led evaluation</li> <li>Evidence sharing and support for the strategic joint evaluation</li> </ul>
United States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential support for the country-led evaluation in Malawi</li> <li>Continued participation as a member of the Coalition's Core Group</li> </ul>
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide technical and guidance support as part of the reference group for the strategic joint evaluation.</li> </ul>
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work on thematic collaboration and share technical work (recent evaluations on similar subjects).</li> </ul>
Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participate in the reference group of the strategic joint evaluation</li> <li>Interest in the country-led evaluation in Malawi</li> <li>Interest in supporting a thematic case study involving SIDS as part of the strategic joint evaluation.</li> </ul>
Luxembourg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will explore avenues of support (funding and/or in-kind) for the country-led evaluation in Burkina Faso</li> </ul>
Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in highlighting the views of partner countries in analysing the response to COVID-19</li> </ul>
UNICEF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in cash transfer and social protection working groups.</li> </ul>
ADB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could provide technical support to various coalition initiatives</li> </ul>
UNHCR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sharing recent findings including a synthesis on UNHCR COVID-19 response was conducted</li> </ul>
UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of the reference group of the Strategic joint evaluation and interest in thematic analysis on social protection.</li> </ul>

UNFPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination with country-office in Malawi about country-led evaluation.</li> <li>• Interest in contributing including a synthesis on Gender-based violence.</li> </ul>
European Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to the future work at the strategic level, in particular with data provision.</li> </ul>
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue engagement in working groups on social protection and cash transfers.</li> <li>• Potential collaboration on country-led evaluation in Bangladesh</li> </ul>
ILO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued engagement with the working group on cash-transfer and social protection</li> </ul>
ERBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue engagement in the Strategic Joint Evaluation</li> <li>• Share data and methodological notes relevant to country-led evaluations.</li> </ul>
ALNAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working on a synthesis of evaluations of the humanitarian response to COVID-19 that will be published later this year (based on the evaluations shared in the joint ALNAP-Coalition database).</li> </ul>
CEPI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to Strategic Joint Evaluation (data sharing)</li> <li>• Engagement of the vaccine-learning group as a reference group for the case study under the strategic joint evaluation.</li> </ul>
Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to specific initiatives will be confirmed.</li> </ul>
Colombia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participated in the management group of the Joint Evaluation of the Protection of Refugee Rights</li> <li>• Contribute with technical assistance to the Strategic joint evaluation</li> </ul>