



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Sixty-sixth session
13-19 May 2010
Incheon, Republic of Korea

**MANAGEMENT ISSUES: EVALUATIONS: REPORT ON EVALUATION
ACTIVITIES OF ESCAP DURING THE BIENNIUM 2008-2009 AND
OUTCOME OF THE EVALUATIONS OF APCICT AND SIAP**

(Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda)

REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF SIAP

Note by the secretariat

I. BACKGROUND

1. In March 2003, ESCAP commissioned an external evaluation of its regional institutions to consider how they could best serve the needs of ESCAP members on a long-term and sustainable basis. The Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific (SIAP) was assessed in terms of the relevance of its programmes, the performance of its activities and its administrative and financial sustainability. The findings and recommendations arising from the evaluation (E/ESCAP/1299, annex I) influenced the strategies and directions of SIAP from academic year 2004 onwards. Five years on, the secretariat embarked on an exercise to assess the extent to which the recommendations from the 2003 evaluation had been implemented and to examine how well SIAP was meeting its objectives in the changing context of the Asia-Pacific region. A consultant was recruited to conduct the evaluation in accordance with the norms and standards for evaluation in the United Nations system, as outlined in the *ESCAP Monitoring and Evaluation System Overview* (ESCAP/PMD/M&E/1/Rev 2).¹

II. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

2. The terms of reference prepared for the evaluation of SIAP emphasized that the exercise should be formative and forward-looking. The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate the operations and work programme of SIAP with a view to ascertaining how it could be strengthened to better serve the needs of the members and associate members of ESCAP. The specific objectives of the evaluation were: (a) to assess the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of SIAP programmes; and (b) to formulate concrete, action-oriented recommendations to increase the responsiveness of SIAP to the needs of countries and the effectiveness of its programmes and to ensure the sustainability of SIAP.

¹ Available at www.unescap.org/pmd/m-e-escap.asp.

III. OUTCOME

3. Due to a range of factors, the report, as delivered by the consultant, does not fully adhere to the norms and standards for evaluation in the United Nations system. As a result of constraints encountered by the consultant in the information collection process, some of the findings and conclusions contained in the report are not directly linked to evidence gathered during the process. The constraints, which are outlined in more detail in the report by the consultant (E/ESCAP/66/19/Add.1), constitute a lesson learned for the secretariat's evaluation staff and will be taken into account in future evaluation processes.

4. The consultant and author of the report, Ms. Denise Anne Lievesley, is an expert in the field of statistics with specific experience in related capacity development and is a highly respected member of the international statistical community. The above constraints notwithstanding, it is the view of the secretariat that the report has merit as an expert opinion paper and that the analysis contained in the report is insightful and of relevance to member States and the secretariat in guiding the future operations of SIAP.

5. The report, as prepared by Ms. Lievesley, is transmitted as an addendum to the present document for the information of the Commission.

.