The 2030 Agenda and evaluation: opportunities and challenges for parliamentarians

National parliaments are crucial in ensuring the 17 Goals in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development are meaningfully translated into national policies and programmes that improve citizens’ lives. Parliamentarians are responsible for making national government accountable and should therefore be strong advocates for using evaluation in policymaking. They can also help lead efforts to develop each country’s wider capacity for evaluation. This briefing discusses parliamentarians’ efforts to build national evaluation capacity and use evaluation effectively. Such tasks are not without challenges, but these, we argue, can be reframed as opportunities.

The ambitious 2030 Agenda, with its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), presents parliamentarians with important opportunities as well as many challenges.

On the one hand, the Agenda lets members of parliament (MPs) demonstrate strong commitment to improving people’s lives and the planet’s wellbeing by clearly linking the SDGs to national and local development agendas. SDG16, the ‘governance goal’, specifically speaks to this: “Peace, justice, and strong institutions: promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.” Two targets within this goal refer specifically to the role of parliaments: 16.6 “Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels” and 16.7 “Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.”

On the other hand, the complexity and interconnectedness of the SDGs challenges MPs to work evaluation into their traditional responsibilities of lawmaking, budgeting, oversight and representation.

Evaluation: a tool

Parliamentarians fulfil three crucial roles in governance. They hold governments to account, establishing a transparent and trusting relationship between state and citizens, and enacting and scrutinising government expenditures. They provide responsiveness, giving citizens a collective national voice that helps identify and meet people’s needs. And of course, they lead on formulating policy, and developing and implementing legislation.

Fundamental to all of these responsibilities is a commitment to, and knowledge of, evaluation: of policies, strategies, programmes and projects. Country-owned evaluations are an important part of follow-up and review processes in the 2030 Agenda, and policymakers have long recognised evaluation as a vital contributor to transparency and evidence-informed decision making.

Parliamentarians can use evaluation to respond to the needs and aspirations of all citizens, including the most vulnerable. Good evaluation helps parliamentarians foster accountability and responsiveness by brokering stakeholders’ values,
Good evaluation helps parliamentarians foster accountability and responsiveness

views and needs while new knowledge is being generated. It does so by challenging "monopolies...of problem definition, of issue formulation, of data control, of information utilization." By engaging differing groups in the processes of generating and interpreting evidence, evaluation lets parliamentarians consider the economic, social and environmental implications of policies, laws and budgetary allocations.

MPs can be political champions and advocates for evaluation in their country-led development plans. In addition, parliamentarians have governance responsibilities for:

- Monitoring and evaluating a country’s progress on the SDG agenda, and the effects of national policies on the global goals
- Facilitating a coherent cross-government approach to the 17 SDGs that recognises their interconnectedness
- Establishing periodic national reviews and evaluations of progress towards the SDGs that are linked to decision making and inform resource allocation
- Involving nongovernmental agencies and organisations (e.g. voluntary organisations of professional evaluators — Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs), think tanks, research and policy institutes, private sector corporations and so on) in planning and evaluating the national sustainable development agenda.

Parliamentarians are promoting evaluation

Many MPs are making strong efforts to develop national evaluation capacity by building an ‘enabling environment’. They are supporting and demanding evaluation in their political systems, bolstering society’s belief in the legitimacy of evaluative information, drafting national evaluation policies, and developing integrated monitoring and evaluation systems.

For example, parliamentarians are heard at local and global conferences and events on evaluation and the SDGs, and a consultation with parliamentarians helped shape the Global Evaluation Agenda 2016–2020. Parliamentarians have also been advocating for evaluation at high level United Nations events, and have been actively engaging in regional consultations on national evaluation policies and systems. Such activities are building bridges between those conducting evaluations and the national decision makers who need evaluative information to shape policies. Together they are developing a stronger shared understanding of how to use evaluation findings and processes in parliamentary debates.

Some parliaments have taken specific actions. For example, Pakistan’s Parliament established an SDG Secretariat to help parliamentarians effectively oversee SDG progress, address the legislative gaps and ensure their constituents’ rights. In Trinidad and Tobago, the Parliament established a new Joint Select Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development. In Zambias, MPs informed a SDGs caucus. In Sri Lanka, the Parliament established a Select Committee on the SDGs. In Finland, MPs were consulted during the preparation of the first Voluntary National Review, they chair the Finnish Development Policy Committee that monitors and assesses implementation of Finland’s international commitments, and they are widely represented in the National Commission of Sustainable Development that governs implementation of the SDGs. In the UK, a Parliament Committee has conducted a critical inquiry that encouraged a shift in government approach to addressing the SDGs.

A regional architecture for parliamentarians’ evaluation advocacy is also emerging. The Parliamentarians Forum for Development Evaluation in South Asia and the African Parliamentarians Network on Development Evaluation (initiated in 2014) are both reflecting MPs growing attention to the role evaluation plays in evidence-informed decision making. There are parliamentarians’ groups in the Middle East and North Africa, East Asia, Latin America and Eurasia. National parliamentarians’ fora have been launched in Nepal, Uganda, Kenya and Sri Lanka. Parliamentarians have spearheaded major evaluation events in national and regional parliaments including in Nepal, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Kyrgyz Republic and in the Latin American parliament, Parlatino. However, most such efforts so far are South-South collaborations, with little engagement from the North.

The Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation, sponsored by EvalPartners, has launched a video campaign inviting parliamentarians from countries across the globe to create video messages on the importance of national evaluation policies. Currently 38 videos are available in multiple languages.

Challenges: but also opportunities

MPs’ efforts to bring evaluation to bear on sustainable development certainly face challenges. But these can also be reframed as opportunities. The most difficult challenges, and thus the most important opportunities, include the following:
Coordinate across government to avoid piecemeal policymaking and evaluation. The SDGs reflect current concerns for parliamentarians and citizens alike. But, importantly, they also connect these issues synergistically, highlighting interconnections that may well include possible trade-offs. These interconnections help parliamentarians think beyond the mere alignment of policies to the SDGs and more carefully reflect about policy coherence across sectors and even policy integration. Thus, MPs have a unique opportunity to move away from a strictly sector-based approach, and instead synthesise evaluations across sectors and so develop much wider policy coherence on development needs. The distinctly inter-related and all-encompassing nature of the SDGs and their targets and indicators will involve many governmental ‘oversight agencies’, such as audit offices, human rights agencies, anti-corruption taskforces and national treasuries in tracking progress. To manage this challenge, parliaments can develop mechanisms or functions for coordinating the evaluative activities of these multiple agencies and synthesising their findings.

Structure work to allow time to interpret evaluative information and also to build capacity in evaluative reasoning. It is one thing to have a policy and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating development initiatives, it is quite another to actually make sense of the information these produce. Doing so requires an ongoing commitment to evaluative thinking, ie using critical reflection to appraise assumptions and claims, coupled with a commitment to continuous learning and a willingness and ability to modify views in the light of reasoned arguments and evidence. Parliamentarians use evaluative reasoning to make effective policy decisions by combining evaluative and scientific evidence, political preferences and widely accepted values. Efforts aimed at building national evaluation capacity should include a strong focus on enhancing people’s evaluative reasoning.

Call for readily understandable and actionable evaluative and scientific information. Policymakers often complain the evaluative and scientific information they get is hard to use, because its format is too technical, too lengthy or not well connected to the particular policy discourse on the policymakers’ agenda. This, of course, is primarily a challenge for evaluators to tackle. But parliamentarians, who rarely have the time to sift through detailed reports, have a role too in clearly calling for reports and findings that are fit for use and actionable.

Define, and then develop, knowledge management systems that support iterative, adaptive management and policymaking. This challenge/opportunity clearly links to the need for understandable information and improved coordination. The aim here must be to ensure evaluative and scientific information actually gets used. Too often evaluative findings are overlooked. This is sometimes because they are just one aspect of information that has been generated and presented in different ways, and by different agencies, without necessarily being ‘flagged’ as evaluation.

Develop country-specific ways of working. As MPs get involved in developing national evaluation policies and mechanisms, they must always be mindful of the danger of uncritical mimicry. There is a natural temptation to build evaluation-focused institutions, agencies, policies and processes that seem commonplace or look like those found in ‘successful’ states (sometimes termed ‘isomorphic mimicry’). But what works in one place doesn’t necessarily suit another. There is no one best practice that fits all states. Rather, states must develop their own ways of working. Agenda 2030 encourages this approach by promoting ‘country ownership’ of the SDGs and their follow-up and review processes.

Understand political motivations and provide political incentives. Politicians’ decisions are inevitably informed and shaped by power differentials, relations, vested interests and social divisions. So parliamentarians must critically consider how such motivations interact with scientific research and evaluation findings in their decision making. All governance actions aimed at implementing and reporting on the SDGs (including work by individuals, committees, working groups and so on) should be grounded in processes and incentives that steer decision makers away from acting uncritically on sectarian interests, populist ideas or for personal gain. In addition, parliamentarians from differing political groups should be engaging with evaluators while the political agenda is being developed, rather than expecting to see evidence just before policies are approved or resources allocated.

Wider support

Given that individual parliamentarians change with election cycles, countries need policies, procedures and agencies that will permanently serve all policymakers’ needs. Efforts to broaden evaluation capacity in society, as well as in parliament, must continue. The international conference National Evaluation Capacities is a good space to assess progresses in evaluation capacity development and explore the way forward. UNDP hosts this conference every two years and in 2017 it will have a specific SDG focus. Additional resources for parliamentarians are listed in Box 1.
Box 1. Resources for parliamentarians
Several resources designed to help parliamentarians get to grips with evaluation are now available online:

- Thomas Schwandt, Asela Kalugampitiya, Caroline Heider, Jos Vaessen, Zenda Ofir, Ada Ocampo, Dorothy Lucks, Kassem El-Saddik and Stefano D’Errico

Evaluators can also learn from the work of the Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) initiative, which has invested significantly in building parliamentarians’ capacity to use evaluation evidence in decision making. Its annual report for 2015/16, for example, discusses such support in South Africa, China, India and Niger.

National governments can strengthen parliamentarians’ efforts to bring evaluation into decision making on the sustainable development agenda by establishing institutional mechanisms that leverage MPs’ roles. For example, voluntary national review committees can be established and given national oversight of SDG implementation.

The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) — with its initiative to build national evaluation capacity — can promote capacity development by specifically attending to parliamentarians’ role in the voluntary national reviews, which are to be reported at the High Level Political Forum.
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