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OVERALL RATING

Highly Satisfactory

Implications:
Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence

Lessons for future evaluations:
This is a high quality evaluation report that can be used with confidence by UNICEF and COs. There is some room for minor improvements. Namely, the evaluation should explain why the Impact criterion was not included in the evaluation framework. Also, there should be explicit reference to the process followed in developing the recommendations.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Highly Satisfactory

The object of the evaluation is described in detail and its key components are clearly explained. Intended beneficiaries (UNICEF and its internal functioning) and the context of C4D’s implementation are well explained as well as the way in which the context relates to the implementation of C4D. Also, the evaluation does an excellent job at explaining the importance of C4D within UNICEF. The evaluation recreates a Theory of Change which is included under methodology. The implementing agency is UNICEF and all its specific roles and contributions are explained in detail.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The intended use and end users of this evaluation are clearly listed, i.e. will guide future work in implementing C4D in UNICEF and strengthen its contribution to country programme results. The evaluation lists 3 main areas of focus and 5 objectives, and the report clearly indicates what the evaluation seeks to achieve. The scope of the evaluation is also clearly explained, i.e. chronologically, the period from 2010 to 2015, with a special focus on 2011-2015; geographically, including 25 case studies (countries). The evaluation also refers to the ToRs in annex 1 for further explanation on the evaluation’s purpose, objectives and scope.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Satisfactory
The evaluation framework is DAC Standard criteria, i.e. covers relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, but it does not explain why Impact was left out. Also, it is stated that the evaluation concentrated on 3 main focus areas and 5 objectives and relevant guiding evaluation questions are provided. The evaluation clearly describes the methodology used, data sources, sampling strategies (i.e. a case-based approach with desk reviews and country case studies), as well as the rationale for the choices made. Also, the report explains how triangulation of several levels of evidence was carried out and how the approach to data analysis varied depending on the different evaluation component. Explicit reference to UNEG ethical standards guiding the evaluation is made in the report and a description of ethical safeguards for participants as well as to the obligations of the evaluators are appropriately discussed.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Highly Satisfactory

The report is particularly strong at providing multiple lines of evidence that support the findings, which are presented under each evaluation criterion and evaluation component. The causal factors leading to achievement or non achievement of results are clearly explained in each case. The evaluation provides a complete assessment of the intervention's M&E system, especially under the evaluation criterion of effectiveness in the capacity development component.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The Conclusions provide a complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the object of evaluation, are based on the findings, and provide insight and added value. Lessons Learned are correctly identified and contribute to general knowledge.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

Recommendations are well grounded in the evaluation and logically derived from the findings and conclusions. They are prioritized, clearly presented, and the target group is identified in each case. Recommendations are useful to intended users and they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation. The first two recommendations are strategic and overarching. The subsequent recommendations are grouped according to the four main components of the evaluation, capacity development, integration, implementation and evaluability. The process followed in developing the recommendations and the stakeholders' level of participation in this process is not clearly explained, although it is stated that each country case study was also overseen by a national evaluation reference group or by an evaluation committee whose responsibility was to review the draft reports and take forward the recommendations.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The report is logically structured, includes all necessary information presented in a very clear fashion that makes the report easy to read and navigate. The opening pages include all of the necessary elements, i.e. name, timeframe, date, location, table of contents, graphs, figures, abbreviation list, and list of annexes, which is very complete and greatly increases the credibility of the report.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation uses a human rights-based approach and Gender Equality, Equity, and Participation are consistently mainstreamed throughout the entire report. Similarly, these 4 cross-cutting issues were included in the technical guidance and assessment framework of C4D (annex 8). The level of stakeholder participation in the evaluation is explicitly discussed in the report and it is specified that a steering committee was set up to guide and provide feedback on the evaluation. The style of the report includes gender sensitive language throughout. GEEW is mainstreamed throughout the report and the evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The executive summary provides all necessary elements and presents them in a concise manner. All information presented in the executive summary is later further developed in the body of the report. The executive summary can stand alone and can inform decision making and can therefore be used with confidence. Finally, the executive summary is also presented in French and Spanish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

| 12 | Exceeds requirements |

Recommendations for improvement

| Section A | This section observes good practices |
| Section B | This section observes good practices |
| Section C | The evaluation should explain why the Impact criterion was not included in the evaluation framework. |
| Section D | This section observes good practices. |
| Section E | This section reflects good practices. |
| Section F | There should be explicit reference to the process followed in developing the recommendations. |
| Section G | The evaluation report observes good practices in its structure and delivery of the information. |
| Section H | The evaluation report observes good practices in all elements assessed in this section. |
| Section I | The executive summary observes good practices. |