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OVERALL RATING

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

Implications:

Lessons for future evaluations:

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Highly Satisfactory
Section 1 of the report gives a very vivid and excellent description of the object of evaluation, the context, beneficiary details, implementation status, results framework and intended results, primary stakeholders and their contributions. It also indicates the cost of the project.

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

Highly Satisfactory
The purpose and objectives of evaluation are indicated. Primary users and intended uses of the results mentioned. The geographic, temporal and thematic scope of what is intended to be evaluated is clearly set out.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation adopted standard OECD-DAC criteria. The methodology adopted, including sampling, is described in great detail. Ethical safeguards taken are in accordance with UN and UNICEF guidelines, including taking parental consent for interviewing children. Data sources, methods of data analysis are discussed. Limitations, assumptions, risks, and mitigation strategies are neatly indicated in a tabular form (Table 3).
SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory

The findings are based on evidence from various sources and address all the evaluation questions. The interventions’s results framework is used in assessing outputs and outcomes. There was limited reference to the monitoring system, but lack of gender-wise information in the monitored data is referred to. Cost efficiency is examined to the extent data permitted.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The lessons learnt are correctly identified and the conclusions flow directly from the findings

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory

Recommendations are logically derived from the conclusions and lessons learnt. They are presented neatly in a tabular form indicating who is to take action and what is the priority. Recommendations are made regarding gender mainstreaming and collection of gender disaggregated data through monitoring system. It is mentioned that the recommendations are arrived at through stakeholder consultations.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The report is well-structured with various sections falling into their appropriate positions. Annexes include among others ToRs, Evaluation Matrix, logframe, tools of data collection and lists of persons interviewed.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

GEEW aspects in the design and implementation of the intervention are discussed in response to Evaluation Question 4. The evaluation found that the project design corresponds to international norms and agreements on human rights and that although the principle of gender equality was not at the forefront of the project strategy, there was a good gender balance among the beneficiaries and professionals. As regards to SWAP requirements, a) Evaluation scope includes GEEW considerations; b) Evaluation questions have been included on GEEW in the design and implementation; c) a mixed methodology has been used and data collected with GEEW perspective, and d) data analysis and recommendation reflect GEEW.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Highly Satisfactory
The Executive Summary is well written and includes all the relevant components. The recommendations are set out grouped by category and indicating the agencies that are concerned. It can stand alone as a guide for action. Appropriate numbering of sub-headings would have made the presentation better.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Meets requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Overall the requirements of this section are more than adequately met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Well-written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Overall, a very good presentation of evaluation methodology, and the report more than meets the requirements of this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Findings address all the evaluation questions adequately and systematically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Lessons and conclusions are adequate abstractions from the evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Recommendations are well presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Overall the report is neatly structured and includes all the relevant material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Numbering of Sub-headings would make the Executive Summary better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>