Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation  Evaluation of Mobile Health and Nutrition Teams in Afar and Somali Regions
Sequence No  2016/032
Region  Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
Country  Ethiopia
Evaluation Type  Programme
Year of Report  2016

OVERALL RATING

• • • -  Satisfactory

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

• • • -  Satisfactory
This section is overall strong: the object is well described (though the relative importance of the object to UNICEF could have been more fully articulated), the context is made clear and the key stakeholders and their contributions are well outlined. That said, the intervention logic is not explicitly presented as a theory of change, logic chain or logic framework.

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

• • • •  Highly Satisfactory
This section is strong - it describes the purpose of the evaluation as well as the objectives and scope very well.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

• • - -  Fair
The evaluation criteria are clearly outlined and are relevant. Methods for data collection, analysis and sampling is more mixed as a section: Data collection methods are strong though the design is not as thoroughly and explicitly articulated as it should be; and while data sources are well described, the methods of analysis could be more fulsomely and directly treated and the limitations and constraints would be stronger if mitigation strategies and impact on the study scope were thoroughly explored. The obligations of evaluators are reasonably well treated though could be more thorough, while ethical safeguards for participants are not mentioned.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

• • • -  Satisfactory
The evaluation findings are generally good but not outstanding. That is, they mostly address the evaluation's scope and objectives, but could be more detailed and expansive. They are also good in that they are rooted in strong data and evidence and make effective use of the intervention's RBM elements, but could be stronger if they also identified unexpected effects.

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

- **Fair**

  The conclusions are identified as a further findings section (Section 6.1) rather than as conclusions. Overall these are good. There are no lessons learned in the report.

**SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)**

- **Satisfactory**

  The recommendations are good, drawing upon evidence effectively and offering clearly identified target groups useful and constructive ideas.

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

- **Fair**

  The report contains most of the relevant information though is missing some such as timeframe of the evaluation. Annexes are less complete since they do not include TORs, a list of interviewees, and a list of site visits. The report is logically structured though could be stronger by breaking findings up with finding statements rather than treating each criteria together and by integrating data from section 3 into the findings as well as by correctly labelling conclusions and incorporating lessons learned.

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

- **Fair**

  The evaluation's design and style is relatively weak in terms of incorporating a HRBAP, gender equality and equity, making few direct references and generally not being systematic in disaggregating data. The description of levels of participation of stakeholders is overall good, and there is some good usage of appropriate language. Gender and child rights are partly integrated though could be done in a more thorough and explicit manner, while equity considerations are quite well incorporated and there is good proportionality of levels of participation in the intervention and the evaluation. In general, GEEW is not explicitly and systematically incorporated into the report and into the evaluation in a sufficiently robust manner, this despite some references to gender level analysis in the various sections of the report.

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

- **Satisfactory**

  This executive summary is satisfactory, giving a quite thorough overview of the report and of the evaluation and thus can inform decision-making.
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?
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