EVALUATION ID	
	0240-2015/001

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

	Response
Title of the Evaluation Report	**Evaluación de la Iniciativa Maternidades Seguras y Centradas en la Familia (MSCF) 2010-2014**

Report sequence number	2015/001	Date of Review	08/03/2016	Year of the Evaluation Report	2015
Region	Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office			**Country**	Argentina
Type of Report	Evaluation			**TORs Present**	Yes
Name of reviewer	**ImpactReady LLP - Sara Vaca**				

Classification of Evaluation Report		Comments
Geographic Scope (*Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings*)	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country	
Management of Evaluation (*Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions*)	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.	
Purpose (*Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être*)	3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes	
Result (*Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached*)	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 (*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*)	5.1 Health: Supporting global efforts to reduce under-five mortality through improved and equitable use of high impact maternal, newborn and child health interventions from pregnancy to adolescence and promotion of healthy behaviours. Programme areas: a) Immunization b) Polio eradication c) Maternal and newborn health d) Child health e) Health systems strengthening	

	e) Health systems strengthening f) Health in humanitarian situations	
Level of Independence *(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)*	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	7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme	

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION				
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?** 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. 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.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Object and context				
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? 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.	Yes	The object of the evaluation and the context are well described in the report which provides with some elements to understand the evaluation. However, the information about these two are much more clearly presented in the ToR that provides with a wider overview and more details.		
2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? 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	Yes			
3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Yes			
Theory of Change			Overall the report succeeds in providing a good picture of the evaluation object, context and the parts involved in each of the provinces.	Digging into the logic of the intervention to better understand the theory of change is usually useful both for the evaluation and the implementers.
4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? 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.	Mostly	The ToR present the results, though the report seems to miss this part and though underlying mechanisms are not displayed.		
Stakeholders and their contributions				
5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes	Table 2 in page 15-18 clearly describes the "Dispositivos" or components in charge of each of the actors involved in the project, UNICEF included, which are further developed in Table 6 in page 31.		
6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? 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	Yes			
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
Implementation Status				
8 Is the implementation status described? 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	Yes	The intervention was carried out between 2010 and 2014,		

Highly satisfactory

Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE				
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**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.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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.	Mostly	Objectives are clearly described and the purpose only indirectly. The scope is not really discussed. As happened with the object and context, the information regarding these topics in the ToR happen to be developed in much more detail than in the report itself.		
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. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Yes	Including the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 3) as part of the elements of the evaluation provides with sufficient information about the criteria, questions, methods, indicators and sources used by the evaluation. Many of these decisions were inducted by the ToR and are therefore not particularly further justified.	Highly satisfactory	The report contains enough information about purpose, objectives and criteria and framework to understand the evaluation, though the ToR were more detailed and rich in description of some of these matters.
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			It would have been useful to incorporate in the report some of the information and detail about the purpose and scope provided by the TOR.
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**The document clearly describes the evaluation objectives and purpose, along with the evaluation framework, provided by the evaluation matrix included as annex 3. The report could have gone further in describing these issues though, as done by the ToR as an example.**		

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

Question	cc	Remarks	C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?	Constructive feedback for future reports
Data collection			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. 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.	*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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.	Yes	Sources and methods are correctly described in the evaluation report. Rationale behind the sampling of provinces was provided and detail of the calculations are presented in Annex 2.		
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	Yes			
Ethics				
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	Mostly	The executive summary mentions how the evaluation will be framed by UNEG's ethics code of conduct, but no longer discussed or explained how in the document or annexes.		
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	N/A			
Results Based Management			The document covers satisfactorily the different methodological elements: methods and sources, integration of HR and gender approaches, etc. Ethic issues are partially addressed and other elements also reasonably satisfactory manner.	Ethical issues should be clearly discussed according to UNEG's ethical code.
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.	Yes	According to the report the evaluation could not make use of the data about the outputs partly due to the initial lack of definition of the logic model.		
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.	N/A			

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	The report evidences how the evaluation was sensitive to gender and HR issues, taken into account in the evaluation general approach, in the evaluation matrix, with questions specific about the women's and baby's interests and in the findings section. No particular evidence about the integration of these issues in the monitoring system.
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.**	Mostly	
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.	Yes	

ctory

23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT? 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.	Yes	Highly satisfa
24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY? 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.	Yes	

Stakeholder participation		
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.	Yes	The report describes how each of the groups taken into account as informants have been included. Nevertheless their level of involvement only reached the role as informants, not directly in any of the evaluation activities.
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.	Mostly	
Methodological robustness		
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.	N/A	The report points out how due to the complexity of the intervention and the lack and inconsistencies of the secondary official data there was no way to verify the direct effects of the program, only relevant changes in key indicators such as Children mortality in provinces both participant and no participant, but not their causal links with the project.
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.	Yes	
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	Mostly	
Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The methodology section of the report fulfils the minimum requirements set by UNEG and UNICEF evaluation standards. It clearly describes the methods used, the overall approach, the methods and the evaluation design as it is well presented in the evaluation matrix (Annex 3).**	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	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 *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	Findings are structured answering the evaluation questions included in the matrix, as the ToR do not clearly specify questions beyond the ones contained in the objectives. They are numbered (34 in total) and they make reference to the evidence found along the evaluation. In the Methodology section (in page 23) the report discusses some of the limitations but at a very superficial manner. No much evidence was found about the eventual unexpected results of the intervention.		
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.	Yes			
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		Although these sections do not cover every element of the requirements, the overall appreciation of the findings and conclusions sections is satisfactory. Gaps and limitations are not discussed with sufficient self-criticism and unexpected results do not seem to have been explored. ToR did not particularly asked for cost analysis or causality analysis.	The report should have included more self-critical reflexion about the limitations of the design chosen. Also non indented results should have been explored.
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.	Mostly			
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.	Mostly			
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.	N/A	ToR do not specifically demand for this within the efficiency criteria.		

Contribution and causality			
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.	N/A	The report does not include a clear analysis of the contribution and relationships of causality between the intervention and the results due partly because the ToR do not specifically demand it.	**Highly satisfactory**
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. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	N/A		
Strengths, weaknesses and implications			
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.	Yes	The report treats the project with a critical tone that equally highlights strengths and weaknesses and their causes.	
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.	Yes		
Completeness and insight of conclusions			
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.	Yes	The conclusions are presented in an attractive way, summarizing findings by criteria and including an overall traffic-light judgment with the project's performance. Since they are based in the findings, they incorporate the different stakeholders perspectives.	
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.	Yes		
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).	Yes		

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 and recommendations are presented with a satisfactory quality that allows take the report results with credibility. They are clearly stated with enough detail and level of analysis, and at the same time with some extent of aggregation to capture higher level insights. Conclusions are attractively presented summarized by criteria and including an overall rating of each of them using traffic lights coding.

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? 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.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	The recommendations are interestingly structured by strategic and operational levels, and including ideas of actions to implement them, though they are not clearly prioritized.		
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			**Highly satisfactory**	
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	They clearly identify the target group and seem coherent and realistic with the context, though it is not clearly described the process followed to develop them.	The recommendations are found useful for the evaluation users as they suggest reasonable, relevant actions to improve the improvement areas. Lessons learned were identified too, besides good practices of the project.	Elements for prioritasation or about how participatory the process of elaborating the recommendations was could have been included.
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	Yes			
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.	Mostly			
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	Section VIII in page 76 introduces the Lessons learned by the evaluation team.		
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.	Yes			

Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**This sections of Recommendations and Lessons learned are also very satisfactory for the evaluation reader as they provide with practical application of the evaluation findings and analysis that may support the users to be oriented on how to move forward after the evaluation.**

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
			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.	*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Style and presentation				
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 clear in its structure and the annexes provide outstanding complementary information making transparent the evaluation tools and processes.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes		The report meets requirements regarding the evaluation structure, elements and content.	The executive summary could be slightly more detailed and contain more information.
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?	Outstanding			
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 is satisfactory in its quality and content, though it could be a little more extensive to provide with wider insights about the summary of the report.	Highly satisfactory	
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.	Mostly			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**Overall, report of clear structure and comprehensive annexes. Its executive summary is also satisfactory though it could be slightly more extensive to provide a bigger picture of the summary.**		

Additional Information

Question	Remarks

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	Yes, they are addressed.		
ii/ **Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation** In terms of evaluation	The report contains many graphs and figures that help illustrate its content, many tables also provide clarity and transparency (such as Table 1, Conceptual axes, principles and results, Table 2, Components by stakeholders), the logic model in graph 6, page 32 that includes assumptions, findings are numbered (34), it also includes Best practices of the intervention.		
iii/ **Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation** In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	Section VII in page 74 gathers Good Practices identified in the evaluation.		

OVERALL RATING

Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**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.
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?	Yes	Each of the sections provide sufficient credibility taken on their own.	The report includes a good description of the object, despite its initial lack of definition. Purpose and objectives are well stated along with the evaluation framework. The evaluation matrix provides clear information about the questions, indicators, methods and sources. Findings answer the evaluation questions and conclusions and recommendations are well presented and provide with reliable information for the evaluation users. Overall, the report meets the evaluation standards required by UNEG and UNICEF.
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'.	Yes	The whole document also meets requirements of coherence and consistency.	**Highly satisfactory**
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.	ToRs	Yes	
	Other		

Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**This report evidences a good overall evaluative level, where all the key elements meet the requirements promoted by UNICEF's evaluation standards. It presents some minor weaknesses along the document but also includes many good practices that upgrades its quality, such as including numerous graphs and figures depicting key information.**