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OVERALL RATING

• • • - Satisfactory

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

• • • - Satisfactory
The context which necessitated the intervention discussed and the details of the intervention outlined. Key stakeholders and their contributions identified. The evaluation noted that the intervention was not backed by a well-articulated theory of change.

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

• • • • Highly Satisfactory
The purpose clearly stated. Statement of Objectives was brief and to the point. Temporal, geographic and institutional boundaries of evaluation clearly delineated.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

• • • - Satisfactory
The evaluation followed mixed methodology, which is described in detail in the body of the report and supplemented by Annex 2 and 5. Methods of analysis and triangulation were not explicitly stated.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

• • • - Satisfactory
The findings are logically derived from evidence and are linked to each evaluation criterion and the relevant evaluation questions. Cost analysis was attempted to the extent availability of data permitted. Contextual factors contributing to the success or lack of performance analyzed. The M&E system of the intervention was also commented on.

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

• • • - Satisfactory
The conclusions flow from the findings and carry an extent of generalization. Strengths and weaknesses were brought out and lessons for future identified.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

• • • • Highly Satisfactory
The recommendations are very clearly presented in a tabular form (pp 70-71). The five main recommendations were broken down into a number of sub-recommendations, with the stakeholders, agency responsible for action and the relevant time frame. This displays the action required in very clear terms.
**SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The report is logically structured (except that lessons learnt were placed after the recommendations (p 71)) and easy to navigate. The annexes contain ToRs and other relevant details. List of interviewees gives gender break-up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation integrated equity and gender aspects satisfactorily. It identified the presence of these aspects in the design and of the intervention. It also assessed the involvement of the beneficiaries in the design. EFGR style and language was used and the data collection and analysis incorporated gender issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The summary could have included the nature and dimensions of UNICEF’s response in a few sentences to enable easy understanding of the object of evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?**

| 12 | Exceeds requirements |

**Recommendations for improvement**

- **Section A**: A well-thoughtout TOC would have helped even better evaluation.
- **Section B**: The purpose, objectives and scope were clearly stated.
- **Section C**: Data analysis and reconciliation including triangulation may be explicitly mentioned.
- **Section D**: Findings were derived logically from the evidence and related to each evaluation question. Innovative actions on the part of UNICEF brought out.
- **Section E**: The evaluation is satisfactory on this count.
- **Section F**: The innovative manner of presenting the recommendations is very interesting.
- **Section G**: A well-structured report with all details.
- **Section H**: A satisfactory level of integration of equity and gender aspects was achieved.
- **Section I**: A Good Executive Summary. The intervention evaluated could have been described better.