

Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation	Communication for Development: An Evaluation of UNICEF's Capacity and Action - Case study report for Kyrgyzstan
Sequence No	2016/999
Region	CEE/CIS
Office	Evaluation Office
Coverage	Rep of Kyrgyzstan
Evaluation Type	Strategy
Year of Report	2016

OVERALL RATING	
	Satisfactory
	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
Implications: Lessons for future evaluations:	The report satisfactorily fulfils UNICEF's evaluation standards, though it could have been more explicit in quite a few issues that it seems to take for granted.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

	Fair
	The evaluation report presents the "Communication for Development (C4D)" Strategy in a satisfactory manner. The theory of change behind the strategy is explained, though more information can be found in the ToR than in the report about its origins and rationale. Also information about the context and beneficiaries needs are quite implicit, providing the Background section mainly information about the Country Office (not about the country itself). The strategy involves mainly internal stakeholders but a more explicit analysis and description of their roles, included the C4D Unit would have been helpful.

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

	Satisfactory
	The report describes reasonably well the objectives and purpose of the evaluation and it frames it in the particular timing it is conducted. Although it is clear how UNICEF will use the results, maybe the report could have been more specific regarding who within the organization will be the main users.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

	Satisfactory
	The report describes the methodological part in section 1.3 and successfully explains the evaluation approach and methods for collection and analysis. However, the reviewer missed further reference to UNICEF Evaluation Standards and Guidelines, explicit reference of the evaluators obligations, and deeper analysis of the ethical issues and limitations confronted while conducting the evaluation.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

	Satisfactory
---	---------------------

The evaluation findings cover the main evaluation questions and areas and provide with sufficient levels of evidence. However, given the nature of the object (a strategy that - according to the Executive summary and the conclusions regarding Evaluability - was not sufficiently defined in terms of indicators and causal mechanisms) it was challenging for the evaluation team to make much links with the monitoring system. Unexpected results do not seem to have been explicitly explored.

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



Highly Satisfactory

The conclusions derived properly from the findings and provide a good description of positive and negative aspects of the strategy. Lessons learned are identified in the findings section, at the end of each of the four areas looked by the evaluators.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)



Satisfactory

The recommendations provide with interesting insights about how to improve the design and implementation of the C4D strategy. The target group and their priorities are however not clearly specified.

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



Satisfactory

The report is overall well structured and including all information needed to understand the evaluation. However, the structure of the findings is at times confusing in several regards: they are not structured following the standard 5 criteria, in the green box introducing Section 3. Findings in page 11 it mentions how the section is divided in 8 parts for immediately later, in the paragraph before section 3.1. saying that it is divided in 4; section 3.1.1. according to the green box should be Effectiveness, 3.1.2. Efficiency, when in reality it is Relevance and Effectiveness (in page 12 and on), etc. ToR mention that an external evaluation team will be brought in, but according to the report it would seem as if it is an internal evaluation conducted by the Evaluation Office in New York.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)



Unsatisfactory

Given the nature of the evaluation object, a strategy to mainstreamed effective communication principles and tools in order to improve participation and inclusion and individuals to take part in decisions that affect them and their development, equity and gender issues are implicitly present as participation and inclusion are 2 of their main principles too. Gender is made explicit mentioned in the evaluation evidence matrix, where some questions are specifically asking about the gender-sensitivity of the strategy and its implementation. However, no further gender analysis and tools and reference to Human Rights questions or international conventions can be clearly found in the rest of the document

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)



Satisfactory

The report includes an executive summary that provides the reader a good summary of the document. The conclusions are often a repetition from the report and the 12 recommendations are listed without any further categorization (while in Section 5 they are grouped by each of the 4 main areas the evaluation looked into (Capacity development, Integration, Implementation and Evaluability)).

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

3

Missing requirements

Recommendations for improvement	
Section A	Further information on the origin and rationale behind the strategy, about the local context and needs that justify its relevance and about the roles of the different stakeholders would have enriched the section.
Section B	Provide some more detail about the specific users.
Section C	Further explain how the nature of the evaluand determined the choice of the evaluation framework and methods, and include more explicit reference to Human Rights based and Gender-sensitive approaches.
Section D	Exploring unexpected results is required in UNICEF evaluations.
Section E	No comments.
Section F	More clear traceability between findings, conclusions and recommendations could be interesting. More clear details on the target group and priorities of the 12 recommendations provided.
Section G	When introducing the parts within sections, keep a coherent description with the body of the report.
Section H	Make a more explicit effort of making gender, equity and human rights issues more visible within the evaluation report.
Section I	Redact the conclusions in a similar but different way than what's collected in the report.