## EXECUTIVE FEEDBACK

### OVERALL RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lessons for future evaluations:**

- The report would benefit from a better description of what is C4D and how it is expected to lead to improved development results. This would help situate readers who are unfamiliar with C4D and how it is expected to strengthen the Vietnam Country Office.
- Additionally, more contextual information around development effectiveness and C4D would be useful to help the reader interpret the findings. Overall, the methodology is quite light on collecting field evidence, as the evaluator only spent 5 working days in the country. This is problematic in terms of the quality of the methodology as well as the quality of the findings, as they are not based on a robust set of evidence lines. The ToRs call for a significant number of evaluation questions to be answered. In the future, it will be important to ensure that the evaluator is provided with enough time in-country to gather a sufficient level of evidence to respond to the evaluation questions. The report needs to be edited to comply with the GEROS standards, as many key elements are missing or weak such as information on ethics, lessons learned, and unexpected findings. Even though the ToRs call for the evaluation to use a gender sensitive analysis and evaluation questions are designed to collect gender-sensitive information, the report needs to better reflect this through the consistent application of a gender-sensitive analysis throughout the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

### SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>The concept of C4D and how it is meant to advance development is not well explained in the report, making it difficult for someone without previous knowledge of the subject matter to interpret the findings. The context in which the country programme operates is also not well explained (in terms of economic, social, and development conditions). Even so, the report does make an effort to situate C4D activities within the country office, even though it doesn't identify the total budget allocated towards C4D activities. Stakeholders and partners who work with UNICEF around the theme of C4D (if they exist), along with their roles and contributions, are not identified. A generic UNICEF-wide theory of change for C4D is presented in Annex 4 but does not identify expected results at the country level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The report clearly identifies the evaluation purpose, including why the evaluation is needed at this point in time, who needs the information, and how the information will be used. Specific evaluation objectives are also provided and link to the evaluation purpose. The evaluation scope is identified in terms of thematic coverage, geographic coverage, and time frame. However, no justification for chosing this specific scope is provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)  
- Fair  
  Overall, the methodology used is problematic, as it was quite light (only a limited amount of qualitative data was collected) due to the fact that the evaluator only had 5 working days in the country to collect information. Additionally, the evaluation methodology is not well explained in terms of why certain methods and information sources were selected (including sampling). On the other hand, evaluation questions are presented in an evaluation matrix (contained within an annex). The evaluation uses the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, along with the additional criteria of capacity development, integration, implementation, and evaluability. However, a rationale for including the additional non-standard criteria and for not including the standard criteria of sustainability and impact is not provided. The report makes no reference to ethical standards, even though this was called for in the ToRs.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)  
- Fair  
  The evaluation methodology does not appear to be robust enough to generate reliable evidence, therefore the evaluation findings could not marshall sufficient levels of evidence to address all of the evaluation questions (which were very extensive in number). While the report makes reference to a C4D Framework, it is not presented in the report body or as an appendix, making it difficult to know whether the findings were structured in line with the framework. Causal factors leading to the achievement and non-achievement of results are outlined but a more detailed analysis around these factors would be useful. Unexpected findings are not discussed. While the quality of the M&E system is assessed (as being highly inadequate), there is no discussion around using the M&E system for decision-making.

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)  
- Fair  
  The conclusions are well written and provide insights and analysis that go beyond the findings. They discuss the initiative's strengths and weaknesses and the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future. Lessons learned are included somewhat sporadically within the findings section and are over specific to the object of evaluation.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)  
- Satisfactory  
  Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and will likely be useful to primary intended users. They clearly identify the target group for action for each recommendation. Although they are numbered, the report does not explicitly state that they are prioritized. No information is provided regarding the process used to develop the recommendations or the level of stakeholder involvement within the process.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)  
- Satisfactory  
  The report is well structured and is easy to navigate, with one section logically leading to the next. However, the context and description of the object of evaluation follows the methodology, which is not according to the standard report format. While the opening pages contain most of the required information, they do not reference the evaluation timeframe. The annexes include all relevant information that adds credibility to the report, which include the ToRs, an evaluation matrix, information sources, and evaluation tools.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)  
- Fair
The report explains that an evaluation reference group guided the evaluation but no further information is provided on the extent of their involvement in the evaluation process. The report does not systematically reference or assess human rights and equity issues and does not use sensitive human rights or equity writing styles. Even though a gender-sensitive approach is called for in the ToRs and evaluation questions are designed to collect gender-sensitive data, the report does not include a gender sensitive assessment and findings, conclusions, and recommendations do not reflect fully a gender analysis.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

- Fair

The Executive Summary is well written and is a useful length to inform decision-making (5 pages). However, it is missing important elements, including a description of the evaluation methodology, conclusions, and lessons learned.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approaches requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for improvement

**Section A**

More background information around the concept of C4D and how it is intended to improve development effectiveness as well as relevant contextual information at the country level is necessary for a reader who is unfamiliar with the country context and subject matter to interpret the findings. The report would be strengthened by describing how the country office interacts with stakeholders around the theme of C4D and the roles and contributions these stakeholders make to the topic. While it is useful to see a generic ToC model around C4D, the evaluation would have been much stronger if it had identified specific country-level results (although the report does specify that data on this is limited).

**Section B**

A justification outlining why a specific scope (i.e what elements were included and what were excluded) was chosen is a useful and necessary contribution to an evaluation report.

**Section C**

The amount of time allocated to in-country data collection appears to be too little to provide quality evidence in which to base findings. Additionally, the evaluation methodology needs to be better explained in the report in terms of why certain data collection methods and sources were chosen and how they were appropriate to answer the evaluation criteria and questions. A justification for why non-standard evaluation criteria were selected and why some standard evaluation criteria were rejected from the analysis should also be provided. Finally, it is essential for the draft report to outline the ethical principles and standards that the evaluators used when conducting the evaluation. For a list of ethical principles, please see the UNEG Ethical Guidelines.

**Section D**

The significant number of evaluation questions to be answered is not in line with the time frame used to conduct the evaluation (only 5 working days in-country), making it very difficult for the evaluation to marshall sufficient levels of evidence to address the evaluation questions. This also likely affected the evaluation's ability to thoroughly discuss causal factors leading to the achievement or non-achievement of results. Unexpected findings should be clearly identified and ideally placed within their own sub-section. While it is good that the report assessed the quality of the M&E system, it would be ideal for future evaluations to include a discussion around how the M&E system should be used to inform decision-making.

**Section E**

Lessons learned should be phrased in a way that makes them generalizable and applicable to similar programmes in other contexts. It is also ideal to place them within their own sub-section.

**Section F**

Even though the recommendations are numbered, it is useful for the report to explicitly state that they are presented in priority order. Additionally, the report should describe the process followed in developing the recommendations, including any participation from stakeholders.

**Section G**

The evaluation timeframe should be mentioned within the opening pages. Also, the standard report format calls for the context and description of the object of the evaluation to proceed the methodology section.
| Section H | Even though the report mentions the evaluation reference group, it would be useful to describe its level of involvement in the evaluation process (including whether or not the members were involved in developing or reviewing the recommendations). The report was designed to collect gender sensitive information but the report's findings, conclusions, and recommendations do not reflect a gender-sensitive analysis. Gender considerations need to be considered throughout the report and thoroughly mainstreamed into all aspects of the analysis. |
| Section I | The Executive Summary would be much stronger if it included a description of the evaluation methodology, key conclusions, and key lessons learned. It is important for the Executive Summary to reflect the main sections of the evaluation report. |