

KNOWING WHAT WORKS

A network diagram consisting of a central hub of concentric circles, with several lines radiating outwards to smaller nodes. The nodes are arranged in a grid-like pattern, with some nodes highlighted in white and others in light blue. The background is a solid blue color.

## GIZ's evaluation system

Corporate strategic evaluations

## Publication details

As a worldwide service provider in the field of international cooperation for sustainable development and international education work, GIZ works with partner organisations to devise effective solutions that offer people prospects and make a lasting improvement to their living conditions. GIZ is a public-benefit federal enterprise and supports the German Government and a host of public and private sector clients in a wide variety of areas, including economic development and employment promotion, energy and the environment, and peace and security.

The Corporate Unit Evaluation reports directly to the Management Board. This organisational structure safeguards its independence vis à vis the company's operational business. The Corporate Unit Evaluation generates evidence-based findings and recommendations. It ensures that evaluation findings are transparent and encourages the company to make active use of these findings.

### Authors

GIZ Corporate Unit Evaluation staff

### Design, coordination and management

Dr Markus Steinich, Head of Corporate Strategic Evaluations and Evaluation Advisory Services, GIZ Corporate Unit Evaluation

### Responsible

Albert Engel, Director of the GIZ Corporate Unit Evaluation

### Published by

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

### Registered offices

Bonn and Eschborn

Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 32 + 36  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
T +49 228 4460-0  
F +49 228 4460-1766

E [evaluierung@giz.de](mailto:evaluierung@giz.de)  
I [www.giz.de/knowing-what-works](http://www.giz.de/knowing-what-works)  
[www.youtube.com/user/GIZonlineTV](https://www.youtube.com/user/GIZonlineTV)  
[https://twitter.com/giz\\_gmbh](https://twitter.com/giz_gmbh)

GIZ uses gender-neutral language.

### Layout/design

now [nau], kommunikative & visuelle Gestaltung, Frankfurt, Germany  
DITHO Design GmbH, Cologne, Germany

Bonn, 2022

# Contents

- Introduction ..... 4**
- 1 Functions ..... 4**
- 2 Determining the evaluation portfolio ..... 4**
- 3 Design and implementation..... 5**
  - 3.1 Quality standards ..... 5
  - 3.2. Quality assurance ..... 6
  - 3.3 Implementation formats..... 7
- 4 Practical application of findings ..... 8**
- 5 Process and responsibilities ..... 9**
  - 5.1 Actors involved and their roles ..... 9
  - 5.2 Process description.....12

# Introduction

This paper explains corporate strategic evaluations as an instrument, from selecting topic areas to the practical application of findings, as well as setting out responsibilities and processes. It addresses all actors involved in the different phases of evaluation. Other target groups include the entire GIZ workforce, especially the organisational units proposing topic areas, external evaluators, members of reference groups, colleagues involved in individual data collection steps and colleagues in the organisational units involved in translating recommendations into action.

## 1 Functions

Corporate strategic evaluations are selected by GIZ on its own responsibility and conducted by the Corporate Unit Evaluation on behalf of the Management Board. They address strategic aspects of corporate development or GIZ service delivery and prioritise benefits for the company.

To enhance the quality and effectiveness of our work, corporate strategic evaluations are designed to generate findings and make recommendations that

- facilitate evidence-based decision-making and steering, especially at strategic level;
- initiate and encourage strategic learning and change processes;
- encourage the updating and further development of strategies, structures and processes in corporate development, as well as service delivery approaches and methods;
- support accountability both within GIZ and towards commissioning parties and the general public, ideally also towards partner organisations and target groups;
- deliver information for strategic positioning, client acquisition and client relationship management at GIZ.

## 2 Determining the evaluation portfolio

Issues to be included in the portfolio for corporate strategic evaluations are collected on an ongoing basis, and commissions placed accordingly, to enable the Unit to respond flexibly to the evaluation requirements of the Management Board. The aim is to address up to five topics simultaneously.

To this end, the Corporate Unit Evaluation keeps a list of issues that can be extended at any time to incorporate new proposals on the initiative of the Management Board, the Strategy Committee, the Management Committee and individual Managing Directors, Directors General of Departments and Directors of Corporate Units. Within the framework of evaluation outlines, the Corporate Unit Evaluation reviews proposals to ensure that they meet selection criteria. Depending on the outcome of this review, the urgency of the evaluation and the resources available, the Corporate Unit Evaluation will put one or more topics to the Strategy Committee, where they are presented by a member of the Strategy Committee or a topic lead nominated by a member. They are then discussed and prioritised. A decision is ultimately taken by the Management

Board on this basis, and a corporate strategic evaluation commissioned.

For the corporate strategic evaluation portfolio, the company identifies strategically important issues in the field of corporate development and/or service delivery. The Corporate Unit Evaluation reviews proposed topics, the Strategy Committee prioritises topics, and the Management Board makes its decision based on the following criteria:

- **Corporate policy significance:** The topic is of overarching corporate policy interest, which may be expressed in key corporate policy papers including the long-term corporate plan, the corporate strategy or the business development strategy, in corporate policy decisions or in strategic projects. It offers particular potential for improving corporate strategies, structures and processes and/or for business development.
- **Specific requirement:** The topic is part of preparations, implementation or follow-up of the corporate strategy or other ongoing strategic processes that need the findings and recommendations of the evaluation as input. This presupposes a realistic time-scale that takes into account both the time limits involved in these strategic processes and the time required to realise an appropriate evaluation design for the issues to be addressed.
- **Need for evidence:** Decision-making and strategic positioning require an in-depth understanding of complex issues related to corporate reality.
- **Evaluability:** A topic is considered to be evaluable if the object of the evaluation can be sufficiently precisely defined, if the evaluation questions can be addressed in sufficient depth within the timeframe and budget available for collecting and evaluating primary and secondary data, and if the data situation makes an evaluation possible. It must be ascertained whether an evaluation is the best way to meet the stakeholders' requirements.
- **Assessability:** Evaluations assess strategic topics in the fields of GIZ corporate development and/or service delivery on the basis of transparent criteria that are already in place or are still to be developed and on the basis of sufficient empirical evidence. This sets evaluations apart from studies that identify the status of knowledge in a field without necessarily conducting an assessment. Studies can also be commissioned or conducted by other organisational units within the company.

## 3 Design and implementation

### 3.1 Quality standards

Corporate strategic evaluations are conducted in line with international and national quality standards, as set out in particular in the OECD/DAC's [Quality standards for development evaluation](#), in the BMZ guidelines [Evaluierung der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit](#) (Evaluating German Development Cooperation. BMZ Evaluation Policy, in German), in the [Standards für Evaluation](#) (Evaluation standards, in German) of DeGEval – Evaluation Society and in the document on the basic aspects of **GIZ's evaluation system**. They are aligned specifically with standards set for usefulness, credibility and independence. These standards are implemented as follows:

- **Usefulness:** The instrument is consistently geared to the benefits for the company, throughout all phases of the evaluation, from selecting topics to precisely defining the object of the evaluation and determining the design to disseminating the findings and acting on recommendations (see Section 4).

Depending on the object of the evaluation and the questions addressed, it is important to incorporate the views of the partner side, and possibly also those of the commissioning party and other external stakeholders.

- **Credibility:** The evaluation objectives, the object of the evaluation, the questions to be addressed and the methods to be used must be clearly described on the basis of current scientific debate and must be communicated. Sources of information are documented. Procedures used to collect data and data sources are selected to ensure that the data obtained is reliable and valid in terms of answering the evaluation questions in line with technical standards. Analyses are based on transparent criteria, which may have been devised in advance, if appropriate, where the OECD/DAC criteria cannot be applied. Conclusions should be evidence-based and specifically drawn from the data collected and analysed so that they can be understood and assessed.
- **Independence:** The Corporate Unit Evaluation reports directly to the Management Board and conducts evaluations independently on the basis of previously agreed evaluation questions. The Unit is able to present critical evaluation findings to other units, divisions and departments within GIZ and can conduct individual evaluations, or components or modules thereof, itself or alternatively outsource them to external evaluators. The internal or external evaluators bear full responsibility for the contents of evaluation reports and thus the assessment of the object of the evaluation.

### 3.2. Quality assurance

The Corporate Unit Evaluation uses the following instruments to ensure compliance with quality standards when corporate strategic evaluations are conducted:

- **Clarification of the mandate:** A comprehensive definition of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, agreed with the body commissioning the corporate strategic evaluation and, if appropriate, with the external evaluators, paves the way for successful evaluation. It prevents conflict from arising during the evaluation and increases the acceptance of the evaluation findings and the satisfaction of all stakeholders with the process used. Evaluation managers must therefore ensure that the outcome of clarifying the mandate of the evaluation is as clear and unambiguous as possible.
- **Inception report:** An inception report summarises the preliminary findings of document analyses and interviews related to the object of the evaluation. It also reflects on gender perspectives of the object of the evaluation and specifies the evaluation design, focus and scope, sets out in detail the evaluation questions and takes a critical look at the quality of the available documents and data. Within the scope of this report, the evaluators entrusted with implementation also develop the data collection instruments to be used. The inception report is a key output to be produced by the evaluators, and the acceptance of this report by the Management Board following discussion in the reference group and with the support of the Corporate Unit Evaluation is key to quality assurance.
- **Methodological requirements:** Evaluations must be based on clear results. The intersubjective verifiability and precision of the findings are of pivotal importance. They are based on data collected and analysed in line with accepted methods of empirical social research. The designs and methods used should be suited to the objective of an evaluation, the questions to be addressed and the object of the evaluation and should be feasible within the framework of the available budget. The integrated use of both quantitative and qualitative methods has proved valuable in this context. Appropriate validation of the results must always be ensured, for example by triangulating methods, cross-checking data and information sources and adopting the 'fours-eyes' principle.
- **Standardised reporting:** Mandatory guidelines for creating evaluation products such as the inception report and the main report stipulate their content and structure and the quality expected. Publication standards also apply. Standardisation must not impact adversely on the usability of the findings. In addition to the evaluation report, needs-driven formats also help in disseminating the evaluation findings.

- **Peer reviews:** Peers in the Corporate Unit Evaluation review the quality of inception reports and main reports. For every corporate strategic evaluation, a quality report is drawn up and filed such that it is accessible for everyone within the company.
- **Comments on the evaluation report:** The final evaluation report or main report is an independent report by the evaluator (in some cases contracted by GIZ). When discussing the draft report, the evaluators are free to decide whether to include in the evaluation report the feedback they receive from the commissioning party, the reference group and the evaluation managers or peers in the Corporate Unit Evaluation, unless the comments relate to services that have been contractually agreed where the evaluation is conducted by external evaluators. Any divergent assessments of the findings should be transparently set out in the Corporate Unit Evaluation's comments on the independent evaluation report. In the comments, the Corporate Unit Evaluation also assesses the quality of the report on the basis of the quality report mentioned above.

### 3.3 Implementation formats

Corporate strategic evaluations can comprise supporting (formative) evaluations, final evaluations and ex-post evaluations depending on the decision-making requirements and the information needed.

Data collection regularly involves document and data analyses, one-on-one or group interviews and other surveys. Data collection may be company-wide or may be limited to criteria-based case studies. The data used as the basis for a corporate strategic evaluation may also include finalised project evaluations assessed within the framework of a cross-sectional analysis/evaluation synthesis.

Depending on the thematic focus and the availability of human resources, corporate strategic evaluations can either be outsourced or implemented by the Corporate Unit Evaluation itself.

- If the focus is on transparency and accountability, if there is an interest in obtaining an assessment from outside the company or if specific technical and/or methodological expertise is required to answer the evaluation questions, it may be advisable to outsource the evaluation.
- Implementation by the Corporate Unit Evaluation is advisable – provided that it has the resources required – if an in-depth knowledge of corporate processes is required for the evaluation, if sensitive corporate data is to be collected or classified documents are to be evaluated, or if specific information is required swiftly. In-house implementation is also advisable where the skills of external evaluators and their ability to deliver an evaluation on a particular subject are deemed to be limited.

In practice, the Corporate Unit Evaluation can play the following roles in the different implementation scenarios:

Outsourcing implementation	In-house implementation	Possible combinations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drawing up a concept note</li> <li>• Tendering/outsourcing</li> <li>• Steering the evaluators</li> <li>• Peer quality assurance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of the entire evaluation by Corporate Unit Evaluation staff</li> <li>• Standard or situation-appropriate process support</li> <li>• Peer quality assurance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering of the entire corporate strategic evaluation, including responsibility for reporting, with outsourcing of individual data collection steps such as case studies</li> <li>• Corporate Unit Evaluation responsible for implementation up to the inception report: initial data collection, e.g. portfolio analysis and evaluation of documents, by the Corporate Unit Evaluation, followed by tendering/outsourcing</li> </ul>

Outsourcing implementation	In-house implementation	Possible combinations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual data collection steps conducted by the Corporate Unit Evaluation (such as online surveys); findings made available to the contracted evaluator responsible for reporting</li> </ul>

## 4 Practical application of findings

Conducting a corporate strategic evaluation, which involves considerable time and expense (also for organisational units outside the Corporate Unit Evaluation), can only be justified if the findings are useful and if they are actually used. The instrument is thus measured against this yardstick at all stages of the evaluation:

- Topics for corporate strategic evaluations are proposed by the Management Board, the Strategy Committee, the Management Committee or individuals at management level 1 in line with their needs. They are then selected using criteria designed to focus on the practical benefits to the company (see Section 2).
- The capacity of the company to deliver plays an important part in the process: in determining the number of corporate strategic evaluations commissioned, selecting the case studies and designing the data collection methods to be used.
- Complex questions that span several business sectors and instruments can be broken down into different topic areas or modules within a corporate strategic evaluation. This means that interim results can be delivered swiftly.
- The reference group meetings serve to regularly raise the question of usefulness during the course of an evaluation and, where appropriate, to make relevant recommendations for steering to the body commissioning the evaluation and/or to add comments to reports to ensure that the findings are genuinely useful.
- When elaborating and coordinating the management response, attention is paid to ensuring that recommendations can be translated into practice and to clearly allocating responsibility.
- The main reports and brief reports on corporate strategic evaluations are published along with the comments of the Corporate Unit Evaluation and the management response on our website at <http://www.giz.de/knowning-what-works>. Depending on the objectives and the object of the evaluation, corporate strategic evaluations can also be sent to partner organisations, commissioning parties and donors. Their central findings and recommendations (management summary) and the action to be taken as a result (management response) are always made available in the form of a brief report in at least German and English. Where valid concerns preclude full publication of a report,<sup>1</sup> an informative summary in German, produced independently by the evaluation team or authorised by them, will be published in a brief report in line with the BMZ guidelines **Evaluierung der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit** (Evaluating German Development Cooperation. BMZ Evaluation Policy, in German). The full reports will

<sup>1</sup> This is the case if evaluations infringe the rights of third parties, if the anonymisation of personal data cannot be guaranteed, if the reports contain business secrets, if they could prejudice ongoing national or international negotiations or if they are critical in terms of foreign or security policy.



be provided on request.

- Important findings and recommendations can be presented and discussed at in-house learning, dialogue and information events. The GIZ's own sector networks play an important role on issues relating to service delivery. The findings are also disseminated outside GIZ online, in publications and in conference papers.
- On the basis of the management response, the Corporate Unit Evaluation coordinates the elaboration of an implementation agreement with the organisational units responsible. The implementation agreement lays out activities, responsibilities (at divisional, section and competence centre levels), timeframes, any additional resources required and pointers for communication. The Corporate Unit Evaluation monitors the implementation status every six months.
- The Corporate Unit Evaluation reports regularly on the main progress achieved on implementation and on actions that have been implemented in full.
- After discussion of the main report, members of the reference group assess the quality of the process used to produce the corporate strategic evaluation. This allows them to reflect on past challenges and propose better ways of dealing with these in future corporate strategic evaluation processes. Once the tasks set out in the implementation agreement have been achieved, individuals involved in the elaboration process should be surveyed to ascertain the usefulness of the corporate strategic evaluation.

## 5 Process and responsibilities

### 5.1 Actors involved and their roles

#### Management Board

The Management Board can propose its own topics for evaluations; it discusses and prioritises proposed topics within the framework of the Strategy Committee and then commissions the evaluations.

The Management Board appoints the Managing Director responsible for the subject matter, who then represents the Management Board as commissioning party and has full decision-making authority. In exceptional cases, the Management Board can delegate this function to a manager (with responsibility for the subject matter in hand) at management level 1.

The commissioning parties are responsible for ensuring that the evaluation is geared towards corporate policy and that it is accepted within the company. They strive to achieve synergies with other relevant processes within the company. They also act as the Corporate Unit Evaluation's contact persons for the corporate strategic evaluation process in the Management Board and are involved in all key decisions. The commissioning parties accept the concept note, the inception report and the main report based on the proposal of the Corporate Unit Evaluation and following discussions within the reference group. Once the Management Board has accepted the management response, they instruct the Corporate Unit Evaluation to draw up specific implementation agreements.

#### Reference group

A reference group comprising representatives from relevant organisational units is set up for each corporate strategic evaluation. The group is established by the responsible Managing Director in response to a

proposal by the Corporate Unit Evaluation in consultation with the directors (general) of the relevant departments and corporate units based on content-related and corporate policy criteria. Its structure should reflect the scope of the topic area as well as responsibilities within GIZ, meaning that both sectoral and managerial levels should be represented. The group's members are appointed by the corresponding organisational unit, which mandates them to represent the unit's position.

Working groups can also support the work of the reference group on selected issues.

The reference group is not a decision-making body. Throughout the entire evaluation process, it advises the responsible Managing Director and the Corporate Unit Evaluation, acting as a sounding board for conceptual and other fundamental issues related to implementation of the evaluation. In this way, it ensures that the evaluation meets GIZ's requirements and that the evaluation process and its recommendations do not overstretch parts of the company. The group discusses and comments on the draft reports and on the conclusions and recommendations; it also plays a key role in drawing up the management response and the implementation agreement and in communicating the evaluation findings. In their capacity as multipliers, the members of the reference group carry the findings and evidence set out in the corporate strategic evaluation into their own departments and corporate units.

### **Management and Strategy Committees**

The Management and Strategy Committees may propose evaluation topics.

On the initiative of the Corporate Unit Evaluation, the Strategy Committee discusses and prioritises proposed topics. It discusses the management response and proposes it to the Management Board to be accepted.

The Management Committee is informed about the implementation agreements, which the responsible units subsequently draw up, coordinated by the Corporate Unit Evaluation.

### **Corporate Unit Evaluation**

The Corporate Unit Evaluation keeps a list of topics for possible corporate strategic evaluations, draws up an evaluation outline for proposed topics, assesses them on the basis of selection criteria and submits them to the Strategy Committee.

It is instructed by the Management Board to conduct evaluations once the decision has been made. It proposes members for the reference group and submits the inception report and main report to be accepted.

The individual corporate strategic evaluations are conducted by a team consisting of a coordinator and other evaluation managers. This team draws up the evaluation concept (concept note), with the involvement of the commissioning party and reference group members, organises tendering and awards contracts, steers these and coordinates implementation of the evaluations, or conducts the evaluations itself. It develops a suitable communication strategy at an early stage to inform the company swiftly about the interim results of the corporate strategic evaluation.

The Corporate Unit Evaluation is responsible for quality assurance of the entire process, the methodological procedure and reporting. The evaluators are responsible for the contents of the main report. The Corporate Unit Evaluation prepares comments on the corporate policy relevance of the object of the evaluation, and on the quality and content of the main report. Based on the discussion at the last reference group meeting, it drafts the management response, discusses and agrees this with the Management Board and reference group members, and coordinates preparation of the specific implementation agreements. The Corporate

Unit Evaluation monitors progress in carrying out the measures set out in the implementation agreement and provides regular updates on progress.

Moreover, the Corporate Unit Evaluation is responsible for publishing the evaluation reports and organises in-person or online learning, dialogue and information events with the responsible units in order to present evaluation findings to the company and, if appropriate, to national and international experts to be discussed.

Although the Unit takes the reference group’s recommendations into account, it is not required to follow the group’s decisions; this is to ensure that the Unit can operate independently. The Management Board has the authority to issue instructions in relation to the specification of the object of the evaluation, but not with regard to the methodological approach and/or the interpretation of the evaluation findings. The decision-making authority within the course of a corporate strategic evaluation is set out below.

Propose topics for a corporate strategic evaluation	Management Board, Management/Strategy Committee, Managing Directors, Directors General of Departments, Directors of Corporate Units
Select topics for a corporate strategic evaluation	Management Board following discussion in the Strategy Committee
Appoint Managing Director responsible for evaluation	Management Board
Put together the reference group	Responsible Managing Director on the basis of a proposal made by the Corporate Unit Evaluation
Accept concept note	Responsible Managing Director following discussion in the reference group
Accept inception report	Responsible Managing Director on the basis of a proposal made by the Corporate Unit Evaluation following discussion in the reference group
Accept main report	Responsible Managing Director on the basis of a proposal made by the Corporate Unit Evaluation following discussion in the reference group
Comment on main report	Corporate Unit Evaluation
Adopt the management response	Management Board on the basis of a proposal made by the Strategy Committee
Adopt the implementation agreement	Units involved in drawing up agreement; Management Committee informed

**Evaluators**

Corporate Unit Evaluation staff, external research institutes, consulting firms or teams of evaluators can be

commissioned to carry out the individual evaluations.

In addition to evaluators, renowned international sector experts can be recruited to support the evaluation if this would improve the quality of the evaluation findings in terms of methodology and expertise. The evaluators bear full responsibility for the contents of the evaluation report.

### BMZ, German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval)

Once a corporate strategic evaluation on a new topic has been commissioned by the Management Board, the Corporate Unit Evaluation informs the BMZ evaluation division, in its capacity as representative of the Shareholder, as well as the German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval) to provide for consultation and coordination with DEval's evaluation programme where necessary. The process of publishing the corporate strategic evaluation's main report generally includes submitting a copy to BMZ's evaluation division and to DEval. If BMZ and DEval are interested, the findings can be presented and discussed there. If corporate strategic evaluations involve interviews with BMZ staff in Germany or abroad or if data and information are requested from BMZ, BMZ will be provided with working papers too on request (evaluation outline, evaluation concept, inception report) for information purposes.

## 5.2 Process description

Process step	Responsible	Contributors	To be informed	Remarks
<b>Determining the evaluation portfolio</b>				
Collect topics	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Management Board, Management Committee, Strategy Committee, management level 1		Ongoing collection of topics
Review proposals	Corporate Unit Evaluation			Based on selection criteria set out in Section 2
Prepare evaluation outline from proposals	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Proposer of ideas		
Prioritise proposed topics	Strategy Committee	Corporate Unit Evaluation		On the initiative of the Corporate Unit Evaluation based on selection criteria, urgency of evaluation and available resources
Commission corporate strategic evaluation	Management Board		Corporate Unit Evaluation	
Appoint responsible Managing Director	Management Board		Corporate Unit Evaluation	
Inform BMZ and DEval	Corporate Unit Evaluation			
<b>Conducting individual corporate strategic evaluations</b>				
<b>1. Prepare the corporate strategic evaluation</b>				
Put together team	Corporate Unit Evaluation			Team of at least two with a coordinator
Clarify mandate with responsible Managing Director	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Responsible Managing Director, proposer of ideas		Review of evaluation outline, especially in terms of:  decision-making and information requirements and the intended use of evaluation findings  evaluation objectives and questions  proposals for the reference group

Process step	Responsible	Contributors	To be informed	Remarks
				decision on whether to conduct evaluation internally/externally  <i>(The following sections describe external evaluations, which is the normal case)</i>
Establish a reference group	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Responsible Managing Director, Director General of Department/Director of Corporate Unit		Responsible Managing Director decides in consultation with relevant departments/ corporate units
Draw up a concept note	Corporate Unit Evaluation			Specify the object of the evaluation and the evaluation questions as well as the evaluation design
Accept concept note	Responsible Managing Director	Corporate Unit Evaluation, reference group		
Award contract to external evaluators	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Procurement and Contracting Division	Responsible Managing Director	Place commission in line with P+R
<b>2. Conduct corporate strategic evaluation</b>				
Exploratory data collection and analysis	Contractor, possibly Corporate Unit Evaluation	Relevant organisational units		Clarify data basis; develop data collection instruments; conduct initial interviews and document analyses
Draft inception report	Contractor, possibly Corporate Unit Evaluation			Evaluation and data collection design discussed and agreed with Corporate Unit Evaluation
Discuss and comment on inception report	Corporate Unit Evaluation, reference group	Responsible Managing Director		Comments by responsible Managing Director and reference group following quality check by Corporate Unit Evaluation (peer review)
Modify inception report	Contractor, possibly Corporate Unit Evaluation			
Accept inception report	Responsible Managing Director	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Reference group	Accept report following another quality assurance check by the Corporate Unit Evaluation
Possibly select case studies (countries)	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Contractor, operational departments/evaluation officer	Reference group, responsible Managing Director	Criteria-based selection
Data collection and analysis	Contractor, possibly Corporate Unit Evaluation			Depending on design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• document analysis</li> <li>• interviews</li> <li>• online survey</li> <li>• case studies</li> </ul>
Draft main report	Contractor, possibly Corporate Unit Evaluation			
Discuss and comment on main report	Responsible Managing Director	Corporate Unit Evaluation, reference group		Comments by responsible Managing Director and reference group following quality check by Corporate Unit Evaluation (peer review)
Modify main report	Contractor, possibly Corporate Unit Evaluation			
Accept main report	Responsible Managing Director	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Reference group	Accept report following another quality assurance check by the Corporate Unit Evaluation
Draw up comments for publication	Corporate Unit Evaluation			Comments on the corporate policy relevance of the object of the evaluation, the quality and the content of the main report

Process step	Responsible	Contributors	To be informed	Remarks
<b>3. Encourage company to make use of corporate strategic evaluation</b>				
Coordinate the management response	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Reference group		The management response is the GIZ management's response to the recommendations. They are shared, some accepted or rejected, depending on the assessment of their relevance and usefulness for the company
Adopt the management response	Management Board	Strategy Committee		Following discussion in the Strategy Committee; authorise publication
Publish main report and brief report	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Corporate Communications Unit		Publish reports (except in the specified cases)
Send main report to BMZ and DEval	Corporate Unit Evaluation			
Coordinate implementation agreement	Corporate Unit Evaluation/lead unit	Reference group with relevant organisational units		List of specific measures based on the management response
Provide information on implementation agreement drafted	Management Committee	Evaluation Unit	Management Board	As information input with assessment of process; publication on management portal
Communicate findings and measures to translate these into practice	Corporate Unit Evaluation, relevant organisational units			In-house at GIZ, partner organisations, other donors (depending on objective and object of the evaluation), other external bodies
Publication	GIZ Corporate Communications	Corporate Unit Evaluation		Publications database Evaluations database German National Library
Publication	Corporate Unit Evaluation			DAC Evaluation Resource Centre (DEReC)
Monitor implementation of agreed measures	Corporate Unit Evaluation, organisational units involved			Six-monthly
Regular reporting	Corporate Unit Evaluation		Company-wide	Regarding progress made on implementing recommendations and completed implementation
Assess the usefulness of the corporate strategic evaluation	Corporate Unit Evaluation	Organisational units involved		Assessment following final implementation

## Sources

### **URL references:**

This publication may contain links to external websites. Responsibility for the content of the listed external sites always lies with their respective publishers. When the links to these sites were first posted, GIZ checked the third-party content to establish whether it could give rise to civil or criminal liability. However, GIZ cannot be reasonably expected to constantly review the links to external sites without concrete indication of a violation of rights. If GIZ itself becomes aware or is notified by a third party that an external site it has provided a link to gives rise to civil or criminal liability, it will remove the link to this site immediately. GIZ expressly dissociates itself from such content.



Deutsche Gesellschaft für  
Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Registered offices  
Bonn and Eschborn

Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 32 + 36  
53113 Bonn, Germany  
T +49 228 44 60-0  
F +49 228 44 60-17 66

Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5  
65760 Eschborn, Germany  
T +49 61 96 79-0  
F +49 61 96 79-11 15

E [info@giz.de](mailto:info@giz.de)  
I [www.giz.de](http://www.giz.de)