

EVALUATION ID

0090-2015/001

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Mostly Satisfactory	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding, best practice	Highly Satisfactory	Mostly Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	

The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

[UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)
[UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#)
[UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#)

	Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation of the Government of Albania and United Nations Programme of Co-operation, 2012-16				
Report sequence number	2015/001	Date of Review	17/2/16	Year of the Evaluation Report	2015
Region	Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO			Country	Albania
Type of Report	Evaluation			TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer	Impact Ready - Susanne Turrall				
	Classification of Evaluation Report				Comments
Geographic Scope (<i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings</i>)	1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.				
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)	2.2 Joint managed, with one or more UN agencies: UNICEF is the co-manager with one or more UN agencies				
Purpose (<i>Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être</i>)	3.8 Country Programme Evaluation (CPE): An evaluation that assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of the entire UNICEF Country Programme				Evaluation of UN ('One UN' combined) and Govt. Programme co-operation
Result (<i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i>)	4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme				
SPOA Correspondence (<i>Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities: (1) Health; (2) HIV-AIDS; (3) WASH; (4) Nutrition; (5) Education; (6) Child Protection; (7) Social Inclusion; (8) Cross-Cutting - Gender Equality; and (9) Cross-cutting - Humanitarian Action</i>)					There is no specific mention of correspondence with a SPOA focus area, and it is cross-cutting. The goal of the Programme of Co-operation is to 'promote sustainable and equitable development, social inclusion, and the adherence to international norms and fulfilment of international obligations, in support of the integration of Albania into the

		support of the integration of Havana into the EU'.
Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.	
Approach	7.3 Summative and formative: An evaluation that combines the elements of a formative and a summative evaluation.	

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Object and context			<p>A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</p> <p>The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this.</p> <p>The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.</p>
<p>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</p> <p>This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.</p>	Mostly	<p>The programme is explained in terms of the background, co-ordination and management, the key 'pillars' but could go further to discuss the outcomes and scope of interventions (results framework is included within the annexe). It is later discussed in the findings section that it was difficult to piece together the theory of change which suggests that there was not an explicit one for the programme, which could have been highlighted up front.</p>	
<p>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</p> <p>The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level</p>	Yes		
<p>3 Does this illuminate findings?</p> <p>The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.</p>	Yes		
Theory of Change			<p>The reports sets out the goals and pillars of the programme, but does not include a theory of change (emerges that there isn't one for the programme and challenging to put together in retrospect). The contextual background and history are strong.</p>
<p>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</p> <p>The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.</p>	Yes	<p>Within an annexe</p>	
Stakeholders and their contributions			
<p>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</p> <p>These include o implementing agency(is) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers</p>	Yes	<p>The stakeholders are discussed in terms of the co-ordination and management arrangements, and that it is a 'delivering-as-one' approach. Given the importance of this it is surprising that more detail is not provided regarding the roles and contributions of the stakeholders. I would have described as 'somewhat' rather than 'mostly' if option was there.</p>	
<p>6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described?</p> <p>This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable</p>	Mostly		
<p>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</p> <p>This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</p>	No		
Implementation Status			<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p>
<p>8 Is the implementation status described?</p> <p>This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc. that have occurred - including the implications of these changes</p>	Yes	<p>It clearly sets out that it is being implement 2012-16 (MTR in 2015).</p>	
			<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>

Executive Feedback on Section A

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.

Up to two sentences

The background and history of the object is well explained, although the scope/ outcomes of the programme could be expanded upon within the introduction (included in findings and annexe). It would be helpful to set out more detail about the stakeholders, their roles and contributions (in fact less is included than in the ToRs).

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Purpose, objectives and scope			
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Yes	The purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation are clear.	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation? The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Yes		
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes		
Evaluation framework			
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Yes	As per the ToRs, the evaluation uses the standard DAC criteria. Impact is not requested given it is in the penultimate year, which is deemed appropriate.	Highly satisfactory
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	Yes		
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The ToRs are very specific and comprehensive in their listing of evaluation purpose, objectives, scope and evaluation criteria and questions which provides a useful agreed framework for the evaluation.		
			Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

Question	cc	Remarks		
Data collection			<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Mostly	This section is brief, listing data collection methods and validation techniques. More detail regarding selection of methods would have been beneficial.		
<p>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits</p>	Yes			
Ethics				
<p>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p>	No	Ethical issues are not discussed within the methodology.		
<p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	No			
Results Based Management			<p>The methods selected appear to be fit for purpose, however they could have been discussed more within the methodology section. There is a gap around ethical issues and stakeholder participation.</p>	<p>The methodology could be discussed in more details. There is no mention of ethical issues and considerations. The programme M&E system is adequately assessed. Gender/ hr and equity considerations are discussed within sections , but are not integral to the language of the report.</p>
<p>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	Yes	It is specified that results are available for the 2012-14 period , prior to the change to the log frame. The monitoring system and its limitations (no outcome level indicators) is discussed within the findings. There was no results chain/ theory of change. The results framework is included within an annexe.		
<p>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's log frame or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.</p>	Yes			

Human Rights, Gender and Equity

20 Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?

This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups. Promote gender-sensitive interventions as a core programmatic priority, To the extent possible, all relevant policies, programmes and activities will mainstream gender equality.

Yes

HR and gender issues are included within a section on UNDG programming principles. They are well dealt with in each section, through findings, conclusions and recommendations - but are not integrated to whole evaluation (and terms not used elsewhere).

21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks?

UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.

Yes

22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)?

The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations. Support for humanitarian action – achieving faster scaling up of response, early identification of priorities and strategies, rapid deployment of qualified staff and clear accountabilities and responses consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of unrest or armed conflict.

Mostly

ctory

<p>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?</p> <p>The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>
<p>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</p> <p>The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>

Mostly Satisfa

Stakeholder participation		
<p>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	No	<p>Stakeholder participation is not specifically discussed. Involvement of different organisations is mentioned only within the different methods used for data collection. However from the methods and list of interviewees it can be assessed that the degree of participation appears to be appropriate.</p>
<p>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.</p>	Mostly	
Methodological robustness		
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p>	Yes	<p>Contribution analysis is used. The methodology appears appropriate and the limitations are considered and acceptable.</p>
<p>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Yes	
<p>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc.). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p>	Yes	
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The methodology appears to be sound, but could be described in more detail. Gender and hr issues are dealt with adequately in sections but could have been more extensively and deeply covered throughout the report (and ethical safeguard issues are absent).</p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings				
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Yes	The findings are systematically addressed in each section, particularly within the effectiveness section where outputs and outcomes are assessed thoroughly . However there appear to be some gaps when checked against the evaluation questions in the ToRs (e.g. relevance -strengthening of national capacities, flexibility of results framework, roles and responsibilities of partners, institution building in gender and human rights.). Gaps, limitations and unexpected findings are all covered.	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Mostly			
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes			
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes			
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	Yes			
Cost Analysis				
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.	Yes	Cost analysis includes actuals and projections and is thorough.	Findings relate to the evaluation criteria and questions, although it appears that there has been a prioritisation of evaluation questions from those in the ToRs which has not been explained in the report.	Findings relate directly to the scope and objectives of the evaluation. The ToRs specified DAC evaluation criteria and many evaluation questions (31 listed , many with sub-parts to them - an ambitious list). The questions were prioritised as per the evaluation matrix (presumably agreed). Generally the findings are methodically organised, and systematically build a picture of the results and contributions of the programme. Conclusions are relevant and clear.

Contribution and causality		
<p>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Yes	<p>Contribution analysis is used but this appears to be more about outputs and outcomes and the pathways of results rather than individual stakeholders. Most of the analysis focuses upon 'the UN' rather than individual UN agencies given that it is intended that the support unifies the UN support.</p>
<p>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Yes	
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
<p>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Yes	<p>Both strengths and weaknesses are considered</p>
<p>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Yes	
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
<p>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Yes	<p>The conclusions are written in some depth, and provide both a summary of findings and further insights. They include perspectives of stakeholders. They are pitched at an appropriate level and are neatly linked to recommendations.</p>
<p>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	Yes	
<p>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p>	Yes	

Highly satisfactory

Executive Feedback on Section D

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.

Up to two sentences

The findings section provides a systematic discussion of results and the contribution of the programme, including discussion around strengths and weakness , and limitations of the data. The evaluation questions responded to relate to those in the evaluation matrix (and not all of those included within the ToRs, presumably they were prioritised and agreed upon).

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	Recommendations are relevant to the purpose, objectives and findings. There are 24 recommendations and they have not been prioritised. They have been clearly stated but are not prioritised.	<p>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</p> <p>Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.</p>
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes		
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Mostly		
Usefulness of recommendations			
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Yes	Recommendations are targeted to two management units unless otherwise stated. Some recommendations are actionable and others appear ambitious (particularly given the number of recommendations). The process in developing the recommendations is clearly stated and satisfactory.	<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p> <p>The recommendations appear to be sound, based on the findings. They have not been graded as 'highly satisfactory' given the sheer number of them and how realistic they therefore are (particularly as they have not been prioritised). There was a good clear process in reviewing them. Lessons distilled are well written.</p>
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Mostly		
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	Yes		
Appropriate lessons learned			
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	Yes	Lessons learned are well distilled, and are a good example on how lessons can be made more generalizable.	<p>The recommendations are relevant to the findings and conclusions. They are organised well - one conclusion is discussed and then relevant recommendations are highlighted. There are however many recommendations - 24 - and many of them are actionable, and some more ambitious such as conducting reviews. They have been reviewed and commented on by Govt and UNCT so it can be presumed that they are considered relevant and appropriate. The lessons section is exemplary in ensuring that lessons are generalised to have broader relevance.</p>
50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	Outstanding		

Executive Feedback on Section E

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.

Up to two sentences

The recommendations are well grounded in the findings and conclusions of the report, and are well organised as emerge from the conclusions (and included in that section). They have been agreed with GoA and UNCTD, but the reviewer is concerned that there are many of them and they have not been prioritised.

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR					
Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
Style and presentation			Highly satisfactory	The report is well organised and structured. It is succinctly written and clear, important for an evaluation of this level and scope. It also guides the readers by setting out the sequence of the report. The executive summary acts as a stand alone document.	
51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Yes	The report is well structured. The opening pages provide a good background introduction to the objet and evaluation itself. The annexes contain all the appropriate components and add credibility to the report.			The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes				A well structured, logically organised and coherent report. It reads well in an accessible style.
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Yes				
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Yes				
Executive Summary					
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	The executive summary can be used as a stand alone summary of the report and to inform decision-making.			
56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	Yes				
57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Yes				
58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Yes				
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The report is logically structured, well presented and well written. The executive summary can be used by itself to inform decision making.				
SECTION G: UN SWAP					
Question	cc	Score	Remarks		

<p>GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected</p>	<p>Partially integrated 1</p>	<p>The evaluation considered how GEEW results have been achieved, but did not assess the design of the programme or how it had been incorporated within the results framework.</p>	<p>G/ Overall SWAP Rating (Automatic).</p>		<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.</p>	<p>Partially integrated 1</p>	<p>The evaluation criteria and questions set out in the ToR include GEEW dimensions. The questions were then presumably prioritised (less questions in evaluation matrix) and some GEEW questions were not specifically addressed in detail (e.g. national capacity in realisation of GEEW, how UNDAF used gender to achieve its goal, data collection).</p>			
<p>A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected</p>	<p>Satisfactorily integrated 2</p>	<p>The national programme did not carry out discussions with indirect beneficiaries, as appropriate. Questions were asked to stakeholders around gender.</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>Approaches requirements</p>	<p>The report could have further integrated GEEW issues in the evaluation questions if they had been more specific.</p>
<p>The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis</p>	<p>Satisfactorily integrated 2</p>	<p>The report includes a section in gender equality which although not extensive covers many aspects (gender mainstreaming, contributions, gender analysis). This was then carried through to conclusions and lessons.</p>			
<p>Additional Information</p>					
<p>Question</p>	<p>Remarks</p>				

<p>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section</p>	<p>The ToRs are comprehensive and clear. The report follows them in terms of the evaluation scope, purpose, methodology. It is presumed that the evaluation questions have been prioritised, as not all evaluation questions within the ToRs have been addressed to.</p>		
<p>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation</p>	<p>The report covers a broad scope, yet is concise style means that it is still accessible. Each of the results areas is systematically addressed and data limitations are clearly set out. Lessons are well distilled, and made generalizable to a wider context.</p>		
<p>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</p>	<p>The programme is broad given that it fits with many national objectives and all areas are covered well (there is no thematic/ sectoral bias).</p>		
<p>OVERALL RATING</p>			
<p>Question</p>	<p>cc</p>	<p>Remarks</p>	<p>OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.</p>
<p>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Each of the six sections is solid - sound methodology, findings which take account of stakeholder perspectives, sound evidence base, useful conclusions. Recommendations are sound though in the reviewers mind, too numerous.</p>	<p>Highly satisfactory</p> <p>This is a high quality credible report, the conclusions are grounded in the findings, and can be used with confidence. The methodology is sound, ToRs have been followed , and there is a good understanding of data limitations in reaching conclusions.</p>
<p>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The sections hold together with clear threads running through them.</p>	
<p>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</p>	<p>ToRs</p>	<p>Very clear steer and guidelines are set out</p>	
	<p>Other</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Overall a high quality report- a sound methodology, awareness of data limitations, systematically developed findings, clear conclusions. Numerous recommendations (24) emerge and it is questioned whether they will be realistically all reached, and it would be beneficial if they had been prioritised.</p>		