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OVERALL RATING

Satisfactory

Implications:

Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

Lessons for future evaluations:

Clearly describing the primary intended users of the evaluation helps to ensure that subsequent aspects of the evaluation are communicated in the clearest possible terms for the intended audience.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

This section is overall strong, with the context and object being thoroughly described, the results chain/logic well articulated and key stakeholders identified. That said, a few parts could be improved, more specifically, the importance of the object to UNICEF and an explicit explanation of how the context and the intervention are related should be provided.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

This section does a good job of succinctly describing the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation, and the latter are clear and realistic.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory

The evaluation methodology section is strong, especially when annex 4: evaluation methodology is considered.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory

This section is good as the findings address the evaluation objectives and scope and are based on a sound analysis of the collected data. An analysis of the results based management elements is present but could stand out more clearly in the evaluation, as could the consideration of the use of monitoring data in decision making.

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

Overall, the conclusions derive from the findings and point out strengths and weaknesses of the intervention quite well. The lessons learned provide quite useful insights and perspectives on the intervention, though enriching and developing the lessons learned so as to include a more in-depth analysis of their effective applicability to other programmes would improve them.
SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

**Satisfactory**

This section is overall good with the recommendations logically derived from the findings and conclusions. The process for developing them has been illustrated but does not include any reference to the participation of stakeholders. They also clearly identify target groups for action and the prioritisation is presented quite clearly. Still, they could have been condensed and streamlined to improve readability.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

**Satisfactory**

The evaluation is logically structured and includes almost all of the relevant information other than the data collection instruments. The report is quite long, which affects ease of navigation.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

**Satisfactory**

The adoption of human-rights approaches and the inclusion of elements of gender analysis throughout the evaluation is satisfactory and shows a good level of commitment to both. Thanks to the use of dedicated criteria, the evaluation properly assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights. The evaluation methodology and data collection tools only partially include a gender analysis component.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

**Satisfactory**

This section is overall quite good and can inform decision making, though it is a bit too long.

---

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Meets requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations for improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The importance of the object to UNICEF and the explanation of how context and intervention are related should be made more explicit and should stand out more clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The intended primary users could be more clearly described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The employed research design could be a bit more clearly and thoroughly described, though is still satisfactory as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The analysis of the results based management elements should be better articulated and their impact on decision-making should be assessed in greater depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>This section could be improved by more strongly articulating how the lessons learned can (or cannot) be applied to similar programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>The number and length of the recommendations could be reduced, so as to focus them and thus ultimately to make them more useful. The role of the stakeholders in the development of this section should be highlighted and discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Data collection instruments such as surveys and questionnaires should be included in the annexes. The report should also be shortened to make information easier to extract and ultimately to improve readability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>The evaluation methodology, data collection tools, and data analysis techniques should be more clearly gender responsive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>The section should be shortened and summarised to improve conciseness and useability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>