Executive Feedback

CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR UNICEF’s EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF SOLAR POWERED WATER SYSTEMS IN SOMALIA

Title of the evaluation

Sequence No 2016/003
Region ESAR
Office Somalia
Coverage Somalia
Evaluation Type Programme
Year of Report 2016

OVERALL RATING

Fair

• • - -

Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may continue to use the evaluation with caution, but substantive improvements are possible.

Implications:

This type of historical review could be more clearly presented by clearly separating performance data (Number or % of functioning well, % of people using them, average distances to the water points, etc.) and evaluation questions and answers (were the systems sustainable, effective, relevant enough?).

Lessons for future evaluations:

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Fair

• • - -

Even though the context is well described, the object of the evaluation is not sufficiently defined. No clear data about the exact dimension of the program, no specific presentation of the logic behind the Solar Powered Supply System (beyond its justification) and very weak information about the different groups taking part in the program and their different contribution, including UNICEF’s. Worth highlighting though the very good description of the situation of the beneficiaries consulted in section 3.1.1 Household Demographics

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

Fair

• • - -
The purpose of the evaluation is clearly stated, though not mentioned who the specific users within UNICEF will be.

The objectives of the evaluation seem to go beyond the average evaluation, including a technical evaluation looking at the appropriateness of the installed hardware including sizing and installation; sustainability and management structures evaluation to ensure long term sustainability and; impact evaluation looking at the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency impacts.

The review finds that some of these concepts appear to be confused in the report as the focus of an impact evaluation is not to assess relevance or efficiency but impact itself, taking into account that the evaluation is looking at the output ("Achievement of

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Fair

The report fails to frame the evaluation approach into any particular evaluation approach, such as UNICEF Evaluation reports guidelines promotes (in particular Gender and HR-based approaches). Having said that, the methodological set up seems robust and proves rigour in its application. However, no mention of the Evaluators' standards or ethical issues where discussed.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Fair

The report provides a significant amount of data regarding the SPWSS though it is difficult to assess if they answer the questions of the evaluation as the evaluation questions are not mentioned. Even though it goes beyond the DAC criteria, doing a study of the present situation of the SPWSS (which would be considered more after-project Monitoring than Evaluation), seems to lack standards or rubrics that define what relevant, effective, and efficient would look like. The findings present data, but in general there is no judgement on whether the findings are considered "good enough" or not.

Unexpected effects of the program do not seem to have been explored.

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

Unsatisfactory

The conclusions again fail to explain if the evaluation team found the findings "good enough" or not. Besides, the structure of the section, including Parameters and Activities as main subsections, is difficult to understand and the conclusions regarding the evaluation criteria are not even present.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Fair

The recommendations seem to be useful for the users of the report who have to decide whether to scale or enhance the Solar Powered Water Systems. However, it is not clear which target group they are addressed to, their relative priority or the process that lead to their elaboration.
**SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)**

- Fair

The report starts by correctly providing the required information in the opening pages. However the structure of the report is not really clear (for example what does exactly mean section 4. Assessment, different from section 3. Findings) and it is difficult to find the evaluative reasoning and conclusions beyond the significant amount of (Monitoring) data including in most of those two sections.

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

- Unsatisfactory

The report lacks of many of the elements needed for a HR and Gender Equity responsive report. The evaluation approach does not mention any of the GEEW principles or conventions, the evaluation questions do not seem to address these issues, no evidence of evaluation matrix and gender-sensitive indicators, and findings and conclusions do not seem to explore who was most/least benefited by the intervention - beyond the geographical variable. Gender analysis and other tools were not either present.

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

- Satisfactory

The executive summary is present at the beginning of the report and is useful to have a complete overview of the document.

---

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

- 3 Missing requirements

---

**Recommendations for improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The report should have provided with more information about the program itself and about the stakeholders involved in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>It would improve the quality of the evaluation report if the objectives were more conceptually clear and the scope was defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The report should have framed the evaluation in a particular, HR-based approach and have mentioned the standards and ethical issues adopted by the evaluation team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The findings section should include indication on whether the program was judged sufficiently relevant, efficient and effective or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The evaluation team should have included conclusions regarding the implications of the findings around the 3 evaluation criteria assessed by the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>This section would be more helpful if including clear target groups and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>The report should have further be guided by UNICEF Evaluation report guidelines in terms of structure and required annexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>The report should have reflected a more gender-sensitive approach that would have mainstreamed the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I</td>
<td>It could have included less repeated paragraphs from the report to provide an extra layer of understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>