UNEG ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

UNEG
United Nations Evaluation Group

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

In 2008, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) formally approved its Ethical Guidelines in Evaluation and Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.[1] This document constitutes the revised Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. The ethical principles outlined below are both firmly grounded in, and build on, the 2016 UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation that provide the agreed normative principles to be upheld in the conduct, management and governance of evaluation.[2]

The **ethical principles of Integrity, Accountability, Respect and Beneficence are designed to be forward looking and to help UNEG members fulfil their common mission**, in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and for the good of the world's peoples. The principles are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. They underlie and inform the application of the 2016 UNEG Evaluation Competency Framework and the 2014 UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations. They are based on the recommendations from the 2019 UNEG Mapping and Review of Evaluation Ethics.

These revised guidelines are consistent with the standards of conduct in the Charter of the United Nations, the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations, the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service, and in the Regulations Governing the Status, Basic Rights and Duties of Officials other than Secretariat Officials, and Experts on Mission as appropriate.[3] They are also consistent with the United Nations' core values of Integrity, Professionalism and Respect for Diversity, the humanitarian principles of Humanity, Neutrality,

Impartiality and Independence and the values enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Rationale

Ethical dilemmas are inherent to evaluation. During evaluations, particularly when in the field, complex judgements may need to be made in unique and dynamic circumstances. There is often an unspoken assumption that evaluators and commissioners share common ethics and will therefore resolve an ethical dilemma in a particular way. Yet, ethics are culturally specific. Different individuals, communities and organizations have their own definitions of what is culturally "right" behaviour. **The "right" or "ethical" course of action is therefore subject to differing interpretations and judgments.**

In the diverse contexts in which the United Nations operates, defining principles of ethics and expected ethical behaviours is particularly important. **Within global development, peacekeeping and humanitarian work, the power disparities are vast** and attitudes, beliefs and behaviours result from a complex web of interlinked and interrelated factors. The priorities of all those involved in evaluation can be very different and this can be particularly- but not uniquely- accentuated in crisis situations.

Systematic attention to ethics helps to **balance the goals of evaluations and those involved in commissioning and carrying out evaluation with the rights and interests of diverse participants and their communities**. In contrast, failure to systematically consider ethics throughout the

---

[1] The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) is an interagency professional network of evaluation units and offices of the UN system, including UN departments, specialized agencies, funds and programmes, and affiliated observers.

[2] These guidelines support implementation of several UNEG norms and standards, while relating very specifically to Norm 6 Ethics, and Standard 3.2 Ethics.

[3] These guidelines do not supersede the obligations and guidance under the Charter of the United Nations (or relevant constituent documents), the staff regulations and rules and duly promulgated administrative issuances issued thereunder. To the extent that the guidelines are in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations (or relevant constituent document), the staff regulations and rules and duly promulgated administrative issuances issued thereunder, the Charter of the United Nations (or relevant constituent document), staff regulations and rules and duly promulgated administrative issuances issued thereunder shall prevail.

evaluation cycle can have adverse consequences for those intended to benefit from and those involved in United Nations' mandate areas.

It is therefore essential that principles of ethics be provided to support the decision making of UNEG members, observers, contractors and sub-contractors around what broadly constitutes "right" behaviour at every step of the evaluation cycle. **Systematic and on-going ethical thinking will ensure regular reflection,** **questioning of assumptions and behaviours as well as enabling appropriate adaptation and response** to emerging situations and crises. This will better enable all those involved in evaluation to hold themselves and others accountable for expected standards of behaviour and to deliver ethical evaluation even in the ever changing and complex contexts in which the UN operates. This is essential as part of the UN's risk management strategy and upholding the UN values.

UNEG definition of "ethics"

There is no overall agreed definition of "ethics" for the UN system.[4] However, for the purpose of this document and for UNEG specifically, this document defines ethics as *the right or agreed principles and values that govern the behaviour of an individual within the specific, culturally defined context within which an evaluation is commissioned or undertaken*.

Purpose of this document

This document aims to support UN entity leaders and governing bodies as well as those organizing and conducting evaluations for the UN to ensure that an ethical lens informs day to day evaluation practice.

This document provides:

♦ Four ethical principles for evaluation;

♦ Tailored guidelines for entity leaders and governing bodies, evaluation organizers, and evaluation practitioners;

♦ A detachable Pledge of Commitment to Ethical Conduct in Evaluation that all those involved in evaluations will be required to sign.

These guidelines are designed to be useful and applicable to all UN agencies, regardless of differences in mission (operational vs. normative agencies), in structures (centralized vs. decentralized), in the contexts for the work (development, peacekeeping, humanitarian) and in the nature of evaluations that are undertaken (oversight/accountability focused vs. learning).

---

[4] Instead ethics are defined through the United Nation's core values of Integrity, Professionalism and Respect for Diversity.

Target audience

These guidelines are primarily intended to support United Nations entity leadership[5] and other personnel, including staff, interns, volunteers, contractors and subcontractors who undertake or commission evaluations. In addition, the guidelines can also **serve as a communication tool for informing those being evaluated and others involved in evaluation** as to expectations in regards to ethics (see Box 4 on the evaluand). Ensuring ethics in evaluation practice is a shared responsibility of all parties.

These guidelines are a public good and can be adapted and used outside of the United Nations.

Accountability for implementation

All UNEG members **commit to applying the ethical principles outlined** in this document in order to bring a consistent and harmonized approach to the continual improvement of the United Nations evaluation system over time.

While there is no formal enforcement mechanism for implementation of these guidelines, there are a **number of accountability mechanisms that UNEG members should consider**. An illustrative list of suggestions is provided below:

♦ Establish an **external review body** responsible for ensuring that the guidelines are implemented (Institutional Review Board or other).

♦ Integrate ethics into the **UNEG peer review** exercise and template.

♦ Integrate these guidelines into **entity specific ethics mechanisms**.

♦ Integrate the guidelines into **entity specific quality assurance mechanisms**.

♦ Use organisation's existing rules of conduct to take **disciplinary actions** towards behaviour deemed unethical.

♦ Ensure a **regular dialogue** in which these principles and their concrete application can be discussed and reflected upon, possibly including a joint act to sign the Pledge of Commitment.

♦ Ensure that there is a **standing item on ethics** (application of these guidelines) at UNEG Annual General Meetings.

♦ Integrate these principles into the **UNEG Competency Framework** as well as personal performance appraisals.

♦ Ensure directors and heads of evaluation **review and sign the Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation upon appointment.** For each evaluation, evaluation commissioners, managers and those who conduct evaluations should **review and sign the Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation, discuss its implications and commit formally and publicly** to the principles laid down in these guidelines. The detachable Pledge can be found in Annex 1.[6]

---

[5] This includes leadership of the United Nations, its funds and programmes, and the Specialized Agencies.

[6] This Pledge of Ethical Conduct does not have the force of law. It is simply a guide to the kind of professional and personal behaviour which is expected of all those undertaking evaluations. However, for staff, failure to comply with the Pledge may amount to misconduct, if by any action or omission, the staff member has violated a staff regulation or rule, taking into account all the circumstances of the case. It is noted that some entities may already have their own such document, in which case the latter could be updated in line with the new UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

2. PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS IN EVALUATION

The four UNEG guiding ethical principles for evaluation are: Integrity, Accountability, Respect, and Beneficence.

INTEGRITY

Integrity is the active adherence to moral values and professional standards, which are essential for responsible evaluation practice.

Integrity in evaluation requires:

- **Honesty and truthfulness** in communication and actions.

- **Professionalism** based on competence, commitment, on-going reflective practice as well as credible and trustworthy behaviour.

- **Independence, impartiality and incorruptibility.** These are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. They mitigate or prevent conflicts of interest, bias or undue influence of others, which may otherwise compromise responsible and professional evaluation practice.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability is the obligation to be answerable for all decisions made and actions taken, and to be responsible for honoring commitments, without qualification or exception[7] as well as to report potential or actual harms observed through the appropriate channels.

Accountability in evaluation requires :

- **Transparency** regarding evaluation purpose and actions taken, establishing trust and increasing answerability on performance to the public, particularly those populations affected by the evaluation.

- **Responsiveness** as questions or events arise, adapting intentions and plans as required. Where corruption, fraud, sexual exploitation or abuse or other misconduct or waste of resources is identified refer to appropriate channels.

- **Taking responsibility** for meeting the evaluation purpose and for actions taken, for exercising due care and, for ensuring redress and recognition as needed.

- **Account giving** through justification and fair and accurate reporting to stakeholders, including affected people, on decisions, actions and intentions.

---

[7] Adapted from UN General Assembly Resolution 64/259.

RESPECT

Respect involves engaging with all stakeholders of an evaluation in a way that honours their dignity, well-being and personal agency while being responsive to their sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBTQ status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability and cultural, economic and physical environments.

Respect in evaluation requires:

♦ **Access to** the evaluation process and products by all relevant stakeholders- be they powerless or powerful, with due attention to factors that may impede access such as sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBTQ status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability.

♦ **Meaningful engagement and fair treatment** of all relevant stakeholders in the evaluation processes- from design to dissemination, facilitating the engagement of stakeholders so they can actively inform the evaluation approach and products rather than being solely a subject of data collection.[8]

♦ **Fair representation** of different voices and perspectives in evaluation products.

BENEFICENCE

Beneficence means striving to do good for people and planet while minimizing harms arising from evaluation as an intervention.

Beneficence in evaluation requires:

♦ **Explicit and on-going consideration of risks and benefits** from evaluation processes, products and longer-term consequences.

♦ **Maximizing benefits** at systemic (including environmental), organizational and programmatic levels.

♦ **Doing no harm**[9] and not proceeding where harms cannot be mitigated (See Box 1 below).

♦ **Ensuring evaluation makes an overall positive contribution** to human and natural systems and the mission of the United Nations.

Box 1: Working with stakeholders and "Do no harm" (non-maleficence)

Beneficence means that it is necessary to achieve a compromise between the risks an evaluation exposes stakeholders to, on the one hand, and maintaining the social change objectives of the evaluation, on the other. Every possible measure should be undertaken to ensure that no stakeholder be put in danger through an evaluation. There are many types of harm that require anticipation and consideration of in evaluations. Examples include discomfort, embarrassment, intrusion, devaluation of worth, unmet expectations, stigmatisation, physical injury, distress and trauma. Political and social factors may also jeopardise the safety of participants before, during or after an evaluation. While "do no harm" applies to all settings and all stakeholder groups, it is a particularly important concept in conflict settings and when working with the least powerful. In these circumstances, a double safety net needs to be in place. This involves the usual considerations plus additional consideration to avoid further perpetuation of exclusion, unmet expectations and distress.

Beyond harm to participants, this principle also requires consideration of potential harm to evaluators themselves, particularly in terms of safety, potential trauma, culture shock and availability of emotional support.

Conversely, there may be situations where powerful stakeholders seek to divert evaluator attention away from potentially confronting or examining uncomfortable areas or truths under the guise of 'do no harm'. Evaluators need to apply professional scepticism and watch out for risks, but also proceed without fear or favour, and carefully, respectfully, and intelligently uncover those truths. In turn, evaluators must ensure that they are using the principle appropriately and not using it to shy away from difficult conversations.

---

[8] This principle should be balanced and coherent with the principle of integrity, particularly in terms of independence, impartiality and incorruptibility.

[9] Harms can be immediate or long-term; physical, social, emotional or psychological; and can relate to the welfare and security of an individual, institution or group, or to the natural environment.

3. GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PRINCIPLES

Implementing the principles is a shared responsibility. All those engaged in commissioning, hosting, designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities as well as those subject to evaluation should understand and adhere to the four ethical principles.

In this section, guidelines are provided for each principle and are tailored to the responsibilities of each of the different UNEG stakeholder groups: (i) entity leaders and governing bodies; (ii) evaluation organizers and (iii) evaluation practitioners. Furthermore, reference is also made to some areas of consideration for the evaluand in order to ensure that they themselves apply ethics in the evaluation process. In some cases, a person may fulfill more than one role. This person would need to refer to the guidelines for each of the roles that they are fulfilling.

Guidelines for Entity Leadership

The **entity's leadership and governing body will hold overall responsibility for ensuring an enabling environment** in which commissioners, managers and evaluators can operate in line with the ethical principles.

The responsibilities for entity leadership and its governing body are laid out below.

INTEGRITY

✓ **Independence:** Provide the evaluation function with sufficient organizational independence by positioning it separately from management functions, and by entrusting it to an empowered Evaluation Head who can carry out her/his duties with the necessary independence (see Box 2) and ensure that those conducting evaluations are also able to do so free from undue pressure. This requirement should be clearly laid down in the entity's Evaluation Policy.

✓ **Organizational culture:** Promote and ensure an organizational culture that is firmly rooted in and fully embodies ethical principles. This is achieved through measures such as: leading by example; promoting a culture of fairness, transparency and learning and; aligning structures and processes of the organization so they are truly guided and inspired by ethical considerations. Also ensure that ethics is embedded in induction programmes, regular professional training and development for all staff and in particular for those organizing or conducting evaluations.

✓ **Competence:** Ensure excellent evaluation competence of those responsible for the organization's evaluation function, including the mastery of evaluation ethics.

ACCOUNTABILITY

✓ **Embedding Ethics:** Ensure that ethics are embedded in the evaluation framework, including in evaluation policies, charters and strategies.

✓ **Organizational Culture:** Promote an organizational evaluation culture that values ethical conduct as a basis for accountability, learning and evidence-based decision-making.

✓ **Use**: Demonstrate commitment to publish, use and act upon evaluation evidence and recommendations as part of public accountability and to drive positive change within the organization and beyond.

✓ **Resourcing:** Invest adequate resources (human, financial and physical) to ensure that the evaluation function can fulfil its mandate and meet established ethical standards. This should include appointing a sufficiently senior ethics focal point/reporting body with the primary responsibilities of 1) providing advice to stakeholders and staff members on issues relating to the independence of evaluations and other ethical concerns, and 2) reporting complaints[10] from stakeholders and staff members with respect to the independence of evaluations and other ethical concerns.

RESPECT

✓ **Resourcing:** Allocate sufficient resources to the evaluation function to ensure an appropriate and inclusive representation and treatment of different stakeholders in the evaluation process.

✓ **Institutional Environment:** Establish a conducive institutional environment that highlights and prioritizes the rights and dignity of evaluation participants, including those managing and conducting evaluations, as per international human rights conventions.

BENEFICENCE

✓ **Consistency:** Consistent with the broader mandates of UNEG member entities, require that evaluation functions work towards the realization of human rights, gender equality and achievement of the SDGs in collaboration with other functions within UN entities. These outcomes should be enshrined in respective evaluation policies.

✓ **Risks and Benefits:** Consider risks and benefits when (a) requesting for certain themes or contexts to be evaluated; (b) endorsing evaluation policies, strategies and plans at all levels of the organization; (c) drafting management responses; (d) implementing management response actions.

✓ **Resourcing:** Provide the evaluation function with adequate resources (financial, human, time) to allow for participatory and empowerment approaches in evaluation (co-creation, two-way feedback, promoting human rights, gender equality, equity and social justice).

✓ **Support:** Where relevant, ensure physical, psychological and medical support are available for stakeholders and evaluation personnel during the course of evaluation.

---

[10] If the complaint refers to a case of work by combined evaluation, audit and inspection offices, then the complaint should not go through audit or inspection.

✓ **Standards:** Ensure that all staff are aware of and reflect on organizational standards for doing no harm, including non-discrimination policies and zero tolerance for sexual harassment, abuse and exploitation, stigmatization, and implement awareness raising measures, including of available reporting mechanisms and processes.

✓ **Carbon neutrality:** Require that all evaluation activities become progressively carbon-neutral by 2030[11] and establish organizational and division/department-wide targets for reducing travel costs.

Guidelines for those who organize evaluations

Those who organize evaluations include **directors and heads of evaluation**, **evaluation commissioners** (e.g. programme managers commissioning an evaluation of their programme), and **evaluation managers and staff** who do not themselves engage in conducting evaluations.

INTEGRITY

✓ **Working culture:** Promote and ensure that the working culture and interpersonal dynamics among the persons involved in the evaluation are in line with ethical principles. Nurture an atmosphere characterized by honesty, fairness and respect. Be aware of and reflective about how people treat each other. Where helpful, exchange views with others in order to build consensus.

✓ **Adherence to principles and standards:** Ensure that the conduct and work of those performing evaluation activities are guided by and adhere to ethical principles and professional standards. This requires being fully aware of ethical guidelines and professional standards of conduct, reviewing them regularly and reflecting continuously on how best to live up to them.

✓ **Ensure Own Competence:** Continually undertake professional development and exchange to strengthen qualifications and expertise for competent and ethical evaluation practice. This can be achieved through formal training, professional exchange, supervision or informal collegial discussions, particularly in relation to ethical challenges in evaluation.

✓ **Ensure evaluators' competence:** Only recruit evaluators with the required qualifications, expertise and experience to ensure the evaluation is conducted in a competent manner, including awareness and knowledge of ethical guidelines. This includes being aware of our own biases and how these affect selection processes.

✓ **Independence and conflicts of interest:** Avoid conflicts of interest, both for oneself and staff/consultants to be hired. Conflicts of interest should be prevented to the greatest extent possible, including reflecting on possible future developments. Where they are apparent or evolving, they should be disclosed and dealt with honestly[12] (see Box 2).

---

[11] Carbon neutrality means making no net release of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. This can be done by, for example, offsetting emissions by planting trees or simply eliminating carbon emissions altogether. Also known as "having a net zero carbon footprint". Carbon neutrality and reduction of travelling should be addressed from an organization-wide perspective, noting that burdensome travel can even inhibit an evaluator's capacity to adequately perform their task.

[12] This is also in line with provisions on conflicts of interest of the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations (ST/SGB/2018/1), in particular under section 1.2 (m).

Box 2: The relationship between independence, impartiality and conflicts of interest

Independence and impartiality prevent bias and are therefore both essential for the credibility of an evaluation. The main difference between the two is that **independence relates to external pressure or influence on those who organize or do evaluations, while impartiality is an attitude towards the evaluated subject**. In other words, independence means that the evaluator should be able to work freely and without outside interference, while impartiality means that the evaluator should not be biased with respect to what is being evaluated.

Conflicts of interest are typically identified by a lack of independence or a lack of impartiality. These conflicts occur when a primary interest, such as the objectivity of an evaluation, could be influenced by a secondary interest, such as personal considerations or financial gains.

Evaluators are particularly exposed to potential conflicts of interest since their assessment may have major consequences on the evaluated subject, such as changes in implementation, reputation or funding. Evaluators, whether they are staff or consultants, may therefore be compromised in their assessment by factors such as money or career prospects, which can lead them, for example, to provide a more positive analysis than what is actually deserved. It is recognized that conflicts of interest generally carry a high risk of bias and must therefore be avoided to the extent possible.

To avoid conflicts of interest, particular care should be taken to ensure that independence and impartiality are maintained. For example, evaluators should not evaluate subjects for which they have worked or had responsibility in the recent past, or in which they have been financially involved. Similarly, they should not evaluate any organization, department or team to which they are presently applying or where there is a significant possibility of being hired in the near future. Conflicts of interest, however, may go beyond such basic rules. They can be manifold and often times ambiguous. It is therefore all the more important to stay aware of any apparent or potentially arising conflicts of interest and to respond to them adequately.

ACCOUNTABILITY

✓ **Apply Principles:** Ensure that the UNEG ethical principles included in evaluation policies, charters, strategies and guidance are systematically applied throughout the evaluation process, starting with their inclusion in the evaluation terms of reference.

✓ **Ethical Review**: Apply informal or formal ethical review processes prior to conducting an evaluation, particularly when primary data collection with potentially vulnerable persons or in sensitive contexts is planned.

✓ **Ethics Expertise:** Ensure that evaluation officers within the entity's evaluation function are trained in ethics. In addition, a staff member could be designated as ethics focal point to provide support to both evaluation managers and those conducting evaluations (be they internal or external) where an ethical dilemma requires discussion in order to find the most appropriate way forward.

✓ **Quality Assurance**: Ensure an explicit assessment of ethical risks and mitigation proposals in inception and evaluation reports and consider a due-diligence ethics check ex-post, as part of the quality assurance process.

✓ **Resourcing**: Allocate adequate resources (human, financial and physical) for the conduct of the evaluation and ensure their responsible use.

✓ **Data management:** Apply clear organizational protocols for responsible data management to ensure that the ethical principles of integrity, respect and beneficence are honoured. (See Box 3)

✓ **Redress**: Establish clear and accessible procedures to report conflict of interest, abuse, misconduct or other serious ethical concerns identified during an evaluation and to seek redress where relevant. For example, through establishing referral pathways to a complaint mechanism outside of the evaluation unit. This mechanism would be able to address concerns and provide support and advice.

> ### Box 3: Ethical and Responsible Data Management[13]
>
> Responsible data management should include specific guidelines on:
>
> - **Collection only of data that are actually needed** and will create value.
> - The protection and privacy of **personal data** in any form, processed in any manner, with particular caution when processing data of vulnerable or marginalized individuals or groups.
> - **Data governance** to clarify data roles, responsibilities, standards and protocols and to ensure accountability for data assets, insights and actions.
> - **Transparent management** of data and analytical products by ensuring that evaluation outputs are comprehensible and traceable.
> - **Secure and safe data collection, storage and use**, with careful management of data leakage or breaches of confidentiality.
> - **Data usage** that is responsible, impartial, and respects, protects and promotes human rights, as well as appropriate international standards. This includes eliminating bias and not discriminating based on gender, race, religion or any other factor.
> - **Other** aspects of data management, as applicable, with reference to the Principles on Personal Data Protection and Privacy adopted by the United Nations High Level Committee on Management (HLCM).

✓ **Transparency:** Communicate openly and transparently, in accessible forms and languages, with evaluators and other stakeholders throughout the evaluation process, to keep all fully informed about expectations, processes and findings. This includes ensuring that the evaluation review and validation process is conducted in a transparent manner that facilitates feedback while safeguarding independence.

✓ **Working Culture:** Create and ensure an environment where ethical issues, including challenges to independence, can be raised and addressed safely and where teams and participants are aware of relevant complaints channels.

RESPECT

✓ **Resourcing:** Invest sufficient resources and time to ensure an appropriate and inclusive representation and treatment of different stakeholders, including the least powerful, at all stages of the evaluation process, including in design and validation phases, where feasible. This includes not deliberately under-budgeting at the outset.

✓ **Diversity and representation:** Ensure evaluation teams include an appropriate representation with regard to sex and a broad mix of backgrounds, skills and perspectives, including national and international expertise.

✓ **Addressing power imbalances**: Recognize and attempt to address power imbalances. Make sure evaluation design allows the voices of the most vulnerable to be heard.

✓ **Confidentiality and Anonymity:** Respect the evaluators' obligations to safeguard sensitive information that participants do not want to disclose to others, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity within their limits.

✓ **Meaningful dissemination:** Ensure evaluation designs incorporate plans to meaningfully disseminate evaluation findings to participants, particularly intended beneficiaries of interventions being evaluated, in an accessible format and language.

✓ **Collaboration:** Work in a collaborative manner, respecting the knowledge and experience of participants and stakeholders.

---

[13] Data Strategy of the Secretary-General for Action by Everyone, Everywhere: With Insight, Impact and Integrity 2020-22, UN, May 2020

BENEFICENCE

✓ **Clear Benefits**: Position the evaluation as an intervention working towards the realization of the greatest good for people and planet. Clearly identify these benefits (e.g. in the evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)), pledge to provide them, and make new knowledge accessible as a global public good. Ensure that every evaluation has a clear purpose and is relevant

✓ **Weighting harms and benefits:** Continuously assess and try to anticipate intended and unintended consequences of the evaluation process and results, at systemic (including environmental), organizational and programmatic levels. This should be part of ongoing risk assessment and mitigation measures. Carefully weigh harms and benefits throughout the evaluation process, e.g. the benefits of remote data collection (in terms of efficiency, carbon-neutrality, adaptability to situations where movement is restricted, etc.) vs. the need to capture the views of the most powerless and marginalized (that we may not be able to access remotely).

✓ **Do no harm**: Avoid causing injury or discomfort, both through acts of commission or omission – with particular diligence required when working in sensitive contexts and with vulnerable populations (link with data/privacy). Ensure safety and security of informants and their data, and of national and international evaluators alike, including zero tolerance for sexual harassment, stigmatization, abuse and exploitation. Evaluations should not proceed where mitigation of harm is not possible. Where unanticipated harm has been identified, ensure redress channels are triggered.

✓ **Carbon neutrality:** Progressively phase in carbon neutrality of all evaluation activities, e.g. by seeking to do as much as possible remotely where this is professionally feasible, working with local evaluators, using innovative tools for data collection, and ensuring the optimal number of people travelling if they must.

Guidelines for those who conduct evaluations

This section provides guidelines for evaluators.

INTEGRITY

✓ **Alignment with ethical principles:** Ensure that your conduct and work are guided by and aligned with ethical principles and professional standards. This requires ensuring that you are fully aware of ethical guidelines and professional standards of conduct, reviewing them regularly and reflect continuously on how best to live up to them.

✓ **Communication:** Communicate truthfully and openly with clients and relevant stakeholders concerning aspects of the evaluation, such as findings, procedures, limitations or changes that may have occurred. Negotiate honestly when estimating the necessary amount of work, related payment, and workload actually performed.

✓ **Professional development:** Continually undertake professional development and exchange to strengthen qualification and expertise for competent and ethical evaluation practice. This can be achieved through formal training, professional exchange, supervision or informal collegial discussions, particularly in relation to ethical challenges in evaluation.

✓ **Competency:** Only conduct evaluations within existing competencies. Evaluators should be transparent and honest about their methodological or technical knowledge. They should not make claims outside their field of expertise.

✓ **Avoid conflicts of interest.** Conflicts of interest should be prevented to the greatest extent possible, including reflecting on possible future developments. Where they are apparent or evolving, they must be disclosed and dealt with honestly (see Box 2).

ACCOUNTABILITY

✓ **Redress:** Ensure participants know how to seek redress for any perceived disadvantage or harm suffered from the evaluation and how to register a complaint concerning the unethical conduct of those involved in the conduct or organization of the evaluation.

✓ **Evaluative Judgements:** Demonstrate in the inception and evaluation reports that the evaluation is conducted in a rigorous, fair and balanced way and that any judgements made are based on sound and complete evidence that can be verified.

✓ **Resources:** Manage resources (human, financial and physical) allocated to the evaluation team in a cost-effective and time-efficient manner.

✓ **Transparency**: Communicate openly and transparently with commissioners and other stakeholders on all aspects of the evaluation process, including limitations. This includes raising ethical dilemmas for discussion and/or action at the earliest possible opportunity and communicating in the evaluation reports and other products on how ethical considerations are considered.

✓ **Wrong-doing:** Be aware of and follow established policies and protocols related to serious wrongdoing, particularly financial wrongdoing, abuse and harassment and report significant problems through the appropriate channels.

✓ **Data Management:** Apply protocols for responsible data management, as prescribed by the commissioning entity.

✓ **Adherence:** Closely follow and ensure that all ethical principles are being abided by throughout the process.

RESPECT

✓ **Ensure prospective participants of the evaluation**: know what they are being consulted on and why; what the intended outputs are and, have sufficient and adequate information for informed consent, including explicitly noting their right to skip questions or withdraw consent at any stage in the evaluation process without fear of penalty.

✓ **Confidentiality:** Respect participants' right to provide information in confidence and ensure that participants fully understand the scope and limits of confidentiality. Evaluators must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source so that the relevant individuals are protected from reprisals.

✓ **Inclusion and Non Discrimination:** Ensure there is equitable participation and treatment of all participants and that they all have an opportunity to voice their perspectives, respecting differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, ability, age, and ethnicity, and be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when carrying out and reporting on evaluations. Where the evaluation involves the participation of members of vulnerable groups, evaluators must be aware of and comply with international and national legal codes governing respecting and protecting the rights of these groups for example, guidelines on researching and interviewing children and young people.[13]

✓ **Show empathy and work in a collaborative manner** with all stakeholders involved, treating evaluation participants, evaluators and evaluation commissioners in a way that honours their professional expertise and personal dignity.

BENEFICENCE

✓ **Clear benefits:** As far as possible, position the evaluation as an intervention working towards the realization of human rights, gender equality and achievement of the SDGs and be clear as to the implications of this positioning. Push for and fully implement participatory and empowerment approaches and other forms of stakeholder consultation to maximise potential benefits to both the evaluation and to those involved in the evaluation.

✓ **Addressing power imbalances**: Make sure the voices of the most vulnerable are heard, including when data collection is remote. Recognize, report on and attempt to address or mitigate against potential power imbalances within the evaluation approaches adopted.

✓ **Do no harm:** Ensure that ongoing risk assessments clarify and mitigate for potential and actual harms that may arise and that go beyond what participants have consented to. This risk assessment must be ongoing and evaluations should not proceed where mitigation- through, for example, alternative methods, is not possible and harm will ensue. Where unanticipated harm has been identified, ensure redress channels are triggered. See Box 1 above for examples of "harm".

While these guidelines target leadership and those responsible for organizing and conducting evaluations, they are also helpful for those who are the objects of an evaluation i.e. the evaluand. Box 4 below highlights some areas of consideration for the evaluand committed to ensuring that they themselves apply ethics in the evaluation process.

---

[13] See also the August 2014 UNEG guidance on integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations.

Box 4: Guidelines for the evaluand

INTEGRITY

✓ **Information:** Provide honest, truthful and full accounts to inform the evaluation.

ACCOUNTABILITY

✓ **Transparency:** Communicate openly and transparently with those organizing and conducting evaluations. Be responsive and openly share all relevant information.

✓ **Independence:** Respect the independent nature of the evaluation and refrain from influencing or applying undue pressure on those conducting it.

✓ **Use**: Take ownership and act upon evaluation recommendations.

✓ **Reporting:** Report issues of wrongdoing or non-adherence to ethical guidelines.

RESPECT

✓ **Access:** Provide/ facilitate access to the evaluation process and products by all relevant stakeholders- be they powerless or powerful, with due attention to factors that may impede access such as sex, gender, age, background, religious, ethnicity and ability.

✓ **Relationships:** Treat evaluation participants, evaluators and evaluation commissioners in a way that honours their professional expertise and personal dignity.

BENEFICENCE

✓ **Be reflexive and reflective:** Proactively raise concerns regarding potential impacts of the evaluation process and results on rights-holders and on pre-existing programmes and services.

✓ **Benefits:** Support stakeholder engagement to maximise potential benefits to both the evaluation and to those involved in the evaluation.

✓ **Safety:** Contribute to ensuring safety and security of informants and evaluators, including zero tolerance for sexual harassment, abuse and exploitation; adherence to social distancing requirements; etc. Ensure proper security protocols are followed and necessary training are completed prior to field data collection.

✓ **Support:** Provide relevant physical, psychological and medical supports for vulnerable or at-risk populations that may be identified during the course of evaluation.

✓ **Carbon-neutrality:** When making local travel arrangements choose train travel where available and carbon off-set air travel.

ANNEX 1: PLEDGE OF ETHICAL CONDUCT IN EVALUATION

By signing this pledge, I hereby commit to discussing and applying the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and to adopting the associated ethical behaviours.

INTEGRITY

I will actively adhere to the moral values and professional standards of evaluation practice, as outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and as per the values of the United Nations. Specifically, I will be:

✓ **Honest and truthful** in my communication and actions.

✓ **Professional**, engaging in credible and trustworthy behaviour, alongside competence, commitment and on-going reflective practice.

✓ **Independent, impartial and incorruptible**.

ACCOUNTABILITY

I will be answerable for all decisions made and actions taken, responsible for honoring commitments, without qualification or exception, and will report potential or actual harms observed. Specifically, I will be:

✓ **Transparent regarding evaluation** purpose and actions taken, establishing trust and increasing answerability on performance to the public, particularly those populations affected by the evaluation.

✓ **Responsive** as questions or events arise, adapting plans as required and referring to appropriate channels where corruption, fraud, sexual exploitation or abuse or other misconduct or waste of resources is identified.

✓ **Responsible** for meeting the evaluation purpose and for actions taken, and for ensuring redress and recognition as needed.

RESPECT

I will engage with all stakeholders of an evaluation in a way that honours their dignity, well-being, personal agency and characteristics. Specifically, I will ensure:

✓ **Access to** the evaluation process and products by all relevant stakeholders- be they powerless or powerful, with due attention to factors that may impede access such as sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBTQ status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability.

✓ **Meaningful participation and equitable treatment** of all relevant stakeholders in the evaluation processes- from design to dissemination. This includes engaging different stakeholders, particularly affected people, so they can actively inform the evaluation approach and products rather than being solely a subject of data collection.

✓ **Fair representation** of different voices and perspectives in evaluation products (reports, webinars etc.)

BENEFICENCE

I will strive to do good for people and planet while minimizing harm arising from evaluation as an intervention. Specifically, I will ensure:

✓ **Explicit and on-going consideration of risks and benefits** from evaluation processes.

✓ **Maximum benefits** at systemic (including environmental), organizational and programmatic levels.

✓ **No harm.** I will not proceed where harms cannot be mitigated.

✓ **Evaluation makes an overall positive contribution** to human and natural systems and the mission of the United Nations.

I commit to playing my part in ensuring that evaluations are conducted according to the Charter of the United Nations and the ethical requirements laid down above and contained within the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. Where this is not possible, I will report the situation to my supervisor, designated focal points or channels, and will actively seek an appropriate response.

_____ (Signature and Date)

ANNEX 2: CHECKLIST OF ETHICAL ISSUES FOR THOSE WHO ORGANIZE EVALUATIONS TO CONSIDER DURING EACH

This checklist is a support tool. Its use is not mandatory. We recommend, however, that it be used systematically during each evaluation phase to ensure that you are working to ethical expectations. If you are "not sure" of the answer, please discuss with others, define your response and then check "Yes" or "No". You will need to balance responses to different questions and then use ethical thinking to conclude on the most appropriate ways forward. If you respond "no" you should be prepared to justify your "no" within the evaluation reporting processes and with the team, including reporting officers/line managers.

1. COMMISSIONING, PLANNING AND DESIGN

	Yes	No
Do those who are to carry out the evaluation have the **required qualification, expertise and experience** to competently conduct the evaluation, including awareness and knowledge of ethical guidelines?		
Did you **avoid conflicts of interest** for those who are to carry out the evaluation, with consideration of possible future developments and opportunities? Did you disclose and deal with conflicts of interest honestly where apparent or potentially evolving?		
Have you checked **whether similar work is or has already been commissioned** by your entity or others?		
Is the proposed approach to **gather evidence the most cost-effective**?		
Are the **timeframe and resources realistic** to achieve the intended purpose and outcomes, including engaging local stakeholders and communicating findings to different stakeholder groups?		
Have you **considered and addressed the UNEG ethical principles** when drafting the terms of reference and assessing technical proposals? Have all those involved in the evaluation **formally signed the *Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation*** and do the potential evaluation firms contracted to conduct evaluations have **adequate ethics guidelines in place**? Is there an **ethical focal point and are evaluators clear** on whom to contact to discuss ethical issues?		
Have you applied **systematic criteria** to determine whether the plan to conduct the evaluation should undergo an ethical review?		
Are there **expertise and mechanisms in place for taking timely action** if ethics principles have been breached?		
Do your evaluation plans and ToRs **allocate sufficient resources and time** to ensure all relevant stakeholders are engaged throughout the evaluation in providing feedback on the design and implementation approach?		
Do your evaluation plans and ToRs identify **appropriate audiences** for evaluation findings and allocate sufficient resources for dissemination in appropriate channels and formats?		
Have you identified and articulated **clear benefits** likely to arise from the evaluation? Do these benefits (participants, the UN community, other stakeholder(s), the environment and society at large) justify the current evaluation?		
Has your **ongoing risk assessment identified any substantial harms** that could be anticipated from participation in this evaluation for informants, evaluators or the environment and have mitigation measures been put in place? Risks can by physical, social (e.g. loss of privacy, loss of status, loss of reputation, stigma) or **psychological/ emotional** (e.g. loss of self-confidence, psychological trauma, stigma etc.) that could be anticipated for informants and evaluators from participation in this evaluation.		
Are there **other harms** to participants, the broader community, or the environment that could be anticipated?		
Have you established **that the evaluation will stop in the event that benefits to the participants are outweighed by harms which are not possible to fully avoid/mitigate**?		
Do the **benefits of the evaluation outweigh** the risks?		
Are **protection protocols** needed (e.g. relevant supports, referrals, protections and services for both vulnerable populations and evaluation personnel)?		
Have you participated fully in required **awareness raising** measures, such as ethics and protection against sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) courses?		

2. IMPLEMENTATION, INCLUDING DATA COLLECTION

	Yes	No
Have you informed staff and contractors of **reporting responsibilities and mechanisms for conflicts of interest** and other ethical issues that may arise during the course of the evaluation?		
Is there a **plan for redress** outlined so that stakeholders and/or the evaluators can report any non-adherence to the ethical guidelines?		
Can evaluation participants including all potentially affected populations **provide feedback** during the evaluation process and/or seek redress?		
Are you ensuring that the evaluators and evaluand are **following through with the guidance on respect, beneficence and integrity**?		
Responsible data management: Do you have **clear protocols for the storage and destruction** of data after the evaluation? Is the **identity and confidentiality of evaluation participants protected** throughout the evaluation process– including qualitative and quantitative data collection, data storage, analysis and reporting? Did you **notify users/participants of any data breaches/** hacking/loss of data that occurred in datasets/research projects where their information was recorded?		
Are your **evaluators trained to understand the local context**, evaluation subject matter and gendered and other cultural norms to ensure appropriate sensitivity when undertaking the evaluation?		
Are the **questions for surveys, focus groups or interviews value neutral, culturally and age appropriate** and not likely to cause stress to participants?		
Are evaluators **working in a collaborative manner and being respectful** of the knowledge and experience of participants and stakeholders?		
Are you minimizing the **carbon footprint** of this evaluation when making travel arrangements? I.e. by opting for train travel where available or carbon off-setting air travel.		
Are there any planned provisions for **monitoring and addressing adverse issues** when identified throughout data collection (e.g. drug abuse, illness or disease, domestic violence)?		
Are there any planned provisions for monitoring and addressing adverse issues (**participants' reactions**) arising during data collection (e.g. worsening of health/emotional state, psycho-traumatizing effect)?		
Are **power imbalances** recognized and addressed? Are **participatory and empowerment approaches** favoured?		

3. REPORTING

	Yes	No
Have you made it clear to those responsible for drafting reports of their obligations to provide a **clear and transparent accounting** of the findings?		
Are **quality assurance processes** in place to ensure that the final report fully represents the findings and conclusions of the evaluators, and has not been amended without their consent?		
Does the inception report include an **explicit assessment of ethical risks and proposed mitigation actions**? Is this assessment further elaborated in the evaluation report to describe ethical issues arising and mitigating actions taken, as appropriate?		
Have you **outlined how stakeholders were engaged throughout** the evaluation process in your evaluation approach or methodology outline?		
Do the **findings of the report appropriately reflect the various perspectives and voices** of the various stakeholders involved?		
Are potential negative impacts of evaluation **findings, conclusions and recommendations** explicitly considered? Have benefits and harms been weighted?		
Where evidence of **wrongdoing** was uncovered, have you discreetly reported it to the relevant competent body and/or representative?		

4. DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION

	Yes	No
Are the findings being **communicated to relevant stakeholders**, ensuring that limitations are clearly noted?		
Are you **publicly disseminating all evaluation products**, taking into account which are the most appropriate forms and languages to ensure accessibility to different audiences, including local populations?		
Are evaluation products being **disseminated promptly to optimize their use and relevance**?		
Do you have **clear protocols for the storage and destruction** of data after the evaluation?		
Are evaluation findings **presented in formats and channels appropriate** for all audiences?		
Have you clearly **communicated the benefits** that arose from the evaluation (or are likely to arise in the future), to participants, the UN community, other stakeholder(s), the environment and society at large, and how these justify the evaluation in the face of potential risks and harms?		

5. ETHICAL ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT ACROSS ALL PHASES OF THE EVALUATION CYCLE

	Yes	No
Are you promoting and ensuring a **working culture shaped by ethical principles**, such as honesty, fairness and respect? Are you and your team aware of and reflective about how you treat others? Do you seek dialogue in order to build consensus?		
Are your **communication and actions** honest and truthful? Are they consistent and in accordance with ethical principles and professional standards?		
Do you and any staff supervised by you have the **required qualification, expertise and experience** for your evaluation work, including awareness and knowledge of ethical guidelines?		
Did you make use of **professional exchange on ethical challenges**, for example through collegial discussions or debriefings with field staff?		
Do you ensure that **conflicts of interest** are being avoided to the extent possible, both for yourself or for any staff you supervise, also regarding possible future developments? Do you disclose and deal with them honestly where apparent or evolving?		
Is the **identity and confidentiality of evaluation participants protected** throughout the evaluation process– including qualitative and quantitative data collection, data storage, analysis and reporting?		
Is there **open and transparent communication** throughout the evaluation process to ensure all stakeholders are fully informed of the evaluation purpose, expectations, processes and findings?		
Do you promote and ensure evaluation teams develop a culture of mindfulness of differences in **societal values and cultures**?		
Have (intended and unintended) consequences of the evaluation process and results been **monitored and addressed**; both on human subjects involved in the evaluation, on pre-existing programmes and services, and on the environment? Have benefits in sum outweighed risks?		
Have mechanisms to prevent and address the **safety and security** of informants and evaluators been put in place (including mechanisms to highlight and address potential sexual harassment, stigmatization, abuse and exploitation)?		

ANNEX 3: CHECKLIST OF ISSUES FOR THOSE WHO CONDUCT EVALUATIONS TO CONSIDER DURING EACH EVALUATION PHASE

This checklist is a support tool. Its use is not mandatory. We recommend, however, that it be used systematically during each evaluation phase to ensure that you are working to ethical expectations. If you are "not sure" of the answer, please discuss with others, define your response and then check "Yes" or "No". You will need to balance responses to different questions and then use ethical thinking to conclude on the most appropriate ways forward. If you respond "no" you should be prepared to justify your "no" within the report and with the team, including reporting officers/line managers.

1. COMMISSIONING, PLANNING AND DESIGN, INCLUDING THE SELECTION AND COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION TEAMS

	Yes	No
Do you have the **required qualification, expertise and experience** to competently conduct the evaluation, including awareness and knowledge of ethical guidelines?		
Did you **negotiate honestly** when estimating the necessary amount of work and related payment?		
When accepting the assignment, did you make sure to **avoid conflicts of interest and address issues of independence**, also regarding possible future developments? Did you disclose and deal with conflicts of interest honestly where apparent or potentially evolving?		
Have you **identified, assessed and made explicit ethical risks and mitigating actions** in the proposed approach/methodology? And/or have you outlined a clear protection protocol identifying these issues and mitigation strategies?		
Have you **identified and agreed on clear protocols** for identifying and reporting unethical behavior or other wrongdoing as well as for adhering to the ethical guidelines?		
Does the proposed design **address the intended use of the evaluation**? Does the methodology represent the most effective use of financial resources and team expertise?		
Have you participated fully in required **awareness raising** measures, such as ethics and Protection against sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) courses?		
Do evaluation plans and ToRs reflect **systematic stakeholder analysis**, identifying all relevant stakeholders of the evaluation and power dynamics between these stakeholders?		
Do evaluation plans and ToRs **allocate sufficient resources and time** to ensure all relevant stakeholders are engaged during design and conduct of the evaluation?		
Do evaluation plans and ToRs **identify appropriate audiences** for evaluation findings and allocate sufficient resources for dissemination in appropriate channels and formats?		
Have you clarified the potential benefits and harms that may arise from the evaluation intervention and agreed mitigating measures? For example, have you asked the commissioner to minimize your **carbon footprint** when making travel arrangements? I.e. by opting for train travel where available or carbon off-setting air travel.		

2. IMPLEMENTATION, INCLUDING DATA COLLECTION

	Yes	No
Have the **information sources for data collection** been selected with due independence and methodological rigour, without relying too much on suggestions from stakeholders?		
Are you clear on **reporting mechanisms and approaches to ethical issues** that may arise? Did you report any ethical issues that arose during implementation?		
Is the **evaluation design, data collection and analysis sufficiently rigorous for its intended use**? Have you applied the highest standards of validity and reliability to maximize the accuracy and credibility of evaluative judgements?		
Have you considered the ethical implications of data collection methods and tools? Are **data collected protected and secure**? Are measures in place to ensure confidentiality and non-attribution of data to participants, particularly affected populations?		
Have you **signed and do you refer to the Pledge of Ethical Evaluation**?		
Can **evaluation participants including populations affected by the evaluation provide feedback** during the evaluation process? Are there processes in place to facilitate this?		

	Yes	No
Data management: Do you have **permission to use any data** collected through photos, videos, or audios? Did you **remain neutral and unbiased** and avoid your personal preconceptions or opinions from interfering with the data collection process? Did you **specify who has access** to the data?		
Have **evaluation participants** been selected in line with the objectives of the evaluation, and not simply because of their availability? Care should be taken to ensure that relatively powerless, "excluded", or otherwise marginalized groups are given the opportunity and means to be represented		
Is the process for obtaining **informed consent** responsive to the individual's agency, literacy level and language and conducted in an appropriate environment so the individual is free to act in confidentiality and free from coercion?		
Does the **informed consent process** include a description of the purpose of the evaluation, foreseeable risks or discomforts because of participation, how the information will be used, and an option to withdraw consent at any stage of the evaluation process without consequence or penalty?		
Is the **composition of the evaluation team sufficiently diverse** in terms of sex, gender, national and international expertise in line with the objectives and requirements of the evaluation ToR and include team member/s who speak the languages of participants who will be engaged in the evaluation?		
Have you pushed for and fully implemented **participatory and empowerment approaches** to maximise potential benefits to both the evaluation and to those involved in the evaluation?		
Are you working in a **reciprocal manner** with informants, not just extracting information but also offering something in return, be it sharing of learning, of good practices, dissemination of conclusions in appropriate formats or other as relevant?		
Are the questions for surveys, focus groups or interviews **value neutral, culturally and age appropriate and not likely cause stress** to participants?		
Are you clear about provisions for **monitoring and addressing adverse issues** when identified throughout data collection (e.g. drug abuse, illness or disease, domestic violence)?		
Are you clear about provisions for monitoring and addressing adverse issues (**participants' reactions**) that may occur during data collection (e.g. worsening of health/emotional state, psycho-traumatizing effect)?		

3. REPORTING

	Yes	No
Did you **disclose potential conflicts of interests** and how they were dealt with in the final report?		
Are the data verifiable? Have the methodology, data collection, analysis and limitations been clearly explained?		
Have you conducted an **explicit assessment of ethical risks and proposed mitigation actions** and included a description in the evaluation report?		
Are you confident that the evaluation has been conducted in a **rigorous, fair and balanced way**? Can the evaluation findings and conclusions be verified and backed up by sound evidence?		
Does the evaluation report explain the procedures undertaken in order to adhere to ethical guidance and any breaches of the guidance?		
Does the evaluation report **explain, and provide justifications and implications, in cases where relevant stakeholders have been excluded** from the evaluation's consultation process?		
Is the **identity and confidentiality of participants protected** in the evaluation report and other products?		
Have you explicitly considered potential negative impacts of evaluation **findings, conclusions and recommendations**? Have you weighted benefits and harms before drafting?		
Where evidence of **wrongdoing** was uncovered, have you discreetly reported it to the relevant competent body and/or representative?		

3. DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNICATION

	Yes	No
Are the findings being **communicated to relevant stakeholders**, ensuring that limitations are clearly noted?		
Are the results of the evaluation **presented in a balanced way, in clear and simple language** that can be easily understood by stakeholders?		
Are the evaluation findings presented in an **appropriate format and channel** for the audience?		
Have you clearly **articulated the benefits** that arose from the evaluation (or are likely to arise in the future), to participants, the UN community, other stakeholder(s), the environment and society at large, and how these justify the evaluation in the face of risks and harms?		

3. ETHICAL ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT ACROSS ALL PHASES OF THE EVALUATION CYCLE

	Yes	No
Are your **communication and actions honest and truthful**? Are they consistent and in accordance with ethical principles and professional standards?		
Have you continuously adhered to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation as well as other policies regarding **ethical behaviour**, including zero tolerance for sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse, and safety and security in the field?		
Are you promoting and ensuring that you and your team have a **culture of mindfulness of differences in societal values and cultures?**		
Are you **communicating clearly to stakeholders throughout the evaluation on the purpose and use** of the evaluation, as well as its methods and approaches including limitations?		
Have you continuously considered the **(intended and unintended) consequences** of the evaluation process and results; both on human subjects involved in the evaluation, on pre-existing programmes and services, and on the environment? Have the benefits in sum outweighed the risks?		