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1. Introduction

On 1 November 2014, states participating in the UNECE Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) are due to submit their national implementation reports (NIRs). Reports are expected to reflect the progress made in the implementation of the Strategy at the national/State level during implementation phase III.

The NIRs submitted by member States will be analysed and an evaluation report will be prepared. Furthermore, the outcomes will be presented to a high-level meeting of education and environment ministries in 2016.

At its 9th Steering Committee meeting, on 3 and 4 April 2014, the Steering Committee is invited to discuss the main contents and the process of preparation of the third evaluation report.

Proposed questions for discussion include:

A. What should be the main contents/chapters of the third evaluation report?
B. On what data should the report be based?
C. Would a member state be willing and able to financially support the preparation of the evaluation report?
D. Other comments / suggestions for the preparation of the third evaluation report?

2. Contents of the third evaluation report

The current UNECE implementation framework and the UN Decade for ESD are coming to an end in 2014/2015. Against this background, it is proposed that the third evaluation report does not focus on the progress made/challenges encountered in implementation phase III only, but rather maps the main achievements and shortcomings of implementing the UNECE Strategy for ESD since its adoption in 2005, drawing also on the reporting results of the 1st and 2nd national reporting cycle. Furthermore it is proposed that the report identifies recommendations for the future implementation of ESD in the UNECE region, taking into account the future Global Action Programme (GAP) as well as informing the development of a future regional implementation framework for ESD.

Proposal for a preliminary table of contents:

A. Achievements in implementing the UNECE Strategy for ESD and analysis of reasons for those achievements
   i. Concerning the six objectives of the Strategy (incl. comparative analysis with phase I and II)
   ii. Concerning the priority action areas of phase III

B. Challenges and shortcomings in implementing the UNECE Strategy for ESD
   i. Concerning the six objectives of the Strategy (incl. comparative analysis with phase I and II)
   ii. Concerning the priority action areas of phase III

C. Future ESD implementation
i. Existing political commitments for continuation of ESD implementation after the end of phase III of the UNECE Strategy for ESD/UN Decade for ESD

ii. Recommendations for future ESD implementation, with a focus on implementation of ESD on regional level (with a view to informing the future UNECE implementation framework for ESD)

3. Data to be used for preparation of third evaluation report

The evaluation reports prepared in 2007 and 2010 were exclusively based on the NIRs submitted to the UNECE Secretariat. In general the reports were of good quality: most were completed entirely, providing both simple yes/no answers and more detailed descriptions of existing measures and activities. This provided a rich source of data from which both quantitative and qualitative conclusions could be extracted.

Some NIRs, however did raise questions with regard to reliability, as they contained inconsistencies in their answers. Moreover, in some sub-regions, only very few NIRs were submitted. So the information provided on some of the sub-regions could by no means be taken as representative for the entire sub-region. In particular in 2010, no sound comparison could be drawn concerning major trends among sub regions.

To ensure that possible data gaps/inconsistencies in NIRs do not impede upon the quality of the third evaluation report, member states could consider to not base the evaluation exclusively on NIRs but in addition to the analysis of submitted NIRs also draw on desk research. The financial implications of both options (analysis of NIRs only / analysis of NIRs incl. desk research) are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data to be used for the 3rd evaluation report</th>
<th>Financial implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Submitted NIRs only</strong></td>
<td>Consultancy costs for analysis of NIR data and drafting of report: ca. 20 000 USD – or – in kind contribution from member state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submitted NIRs 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation reports 2007 and 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. NIRs + desk research, incl.:</strong></td>
<td>Consultancy costs for analysis of report and complementing it with additional desk research: ca. 25 000 – 30 000 USD (depending on extend of additional research carried out) – or – in kind contribution from member state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submitted NIRs 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation reports 2007 and 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of informal country reports submitted for the Committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis of contributions provided for the work of the electronic working groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expert interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If necessary, consultation with focal points about inconsistencies/gaps in national implementation reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>