UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Almost	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding/ Very Confident to Act	Good/ Confident to Act	Almost satisfactory /Almost Confident to Act	Unsatisfactory/ Not Confident to Act	

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section

The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

[UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)   [UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#)   [UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#)

	Response			
Title of the Evaluation Report	Proyecto de Saneamiento Basico Ambientas (SBA) y Tratamiento de Aguas Residuales en Zonas Rurales del Departamento de Caldas: Evaluacion Ex-Post del Proyecto: Informe Ejecutivo			
Report sequence number	2008/010	**Date of Review** 17/12/2010	**Year of the Evaluation Report**	2008
Region	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office		**Country(ies)**	Colombia
Type of Report	Evaluation		**TORs Present**	No
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC			

Classification of Evaluation Report		Comments
Geographical *(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)*	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country	
Management *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)*	2.3 Joint managed, with organisations outside the UN system: UNICEF is the co-manager with one or more organizations outside the UN system	Evaluation jointly conducted by key stakeholders (participating organisations including UNICEF, local government departments, mayoral representatives etc)
Purpose *(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'etre)*	3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes	
Result *(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)*	4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control	
MTSP Correspondence *(Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights)*	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (1. Young child survival & development)	
Level of Independence *(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)*	6.1 Self-evaluation: A significant component of evaluation management activities & decision-making about the evaluation are implemented by individuals associated with the target programme/intervention (eg. programmes officer/specialists)	
Timing / Stage	7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme	A view to learning lessons for the implementation of a second phase.

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

Question	cc	Remarks	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	The project is described in detail in terms of its aims and objectives, anticipated coverage, key actors, design features for impact and sustainability and beneficiary coverage.	**A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?** The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.	
2 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	Yes	The objectives and anticipated results are set out in the report, though these do not in themselves constitute a theory of change		
3 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Yes	The context is clearly and comprehensively described (though there could be more reference to policy frameworks and institutional status)		
4 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes	The key stakeholders and their roles are identified and their contributions stated (though quite generalised).	**Confident to Act** The object of the evaluation is clearly described, including the results expected (though pathways of change are not dealt with in any detail). Key stakeholders and their roles / contributions are clearly stated. The context is generally well described (though there could be additional information on policy frameworks and institutional factors).	The theory of change should be explicitly stated in evaluation reports, or a reason for its omission provided if e.g. not present in project design documentation.
5 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Yes			
6 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
7 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Almost	The implementation status is clarified, but there could be more detail on changes / shifts in strategies, plans etc and their implications, of which there have clearly been several.		
8 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Yes	Yes, the findings are supported by a clear illumination of the context.		
Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**The object of the evaluation is clearly described, including the results expected (though pathways of change are not detailed). Key stakeholders and their roles / contributions are identified and the context is generally well described.**		

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Question	cc	Remarks	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
			The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Almost	The purpose of the evaluation is very succinctly described and is heavily focused on lesson learning. There is no set objectives highlighted. The scope of the evaluation is left implicit rather than made explicit. The rationale for conducting the evaluation at the time is clear although the expected use of the evaluation results is not set out.		
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	No			
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Almost			
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	No	Impact and sustainability are set out in terms of the project understanding of these concepts, but are not explicitly identified as evaluation criteria. Efficiency is considered tangentially but not in any systematic way. Overall, there is no systematic use of evaluation criteria.	**Not Confident to Act** While the purpose of the evaluation is succinctly described, there are no explicit objectives and no use of evaluation criteria beyond a description of the project's (rather than the evaluation's) use of sustainability and impact. There is no coherent use of an approach to rights including gender.	The use of evaluation criteria as per the OECD DAC criteria should be a requirement for all evaluations
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	No	There is no coherent explanation around evaluation criteria		
14 Did the evaluation design consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming? This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender	Almost	There is no explicit use of a rights-based framework but gender is considered at various points as an issue.		
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		The report includes a succinct description of the purpose, but lacks provision of explicit objectives and there is no use of evaluation criteria beyond a description of the project's (rather than the evaluation's) use of sustainability and impact. There is no coherent use of an approach to rights, though gender is partially addressed.		

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

Question	cc	Remarks		
15 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.	No	There is only a brief description of the methodology though reference is made to an Annex which contains further detail. There is no rationale presented.	**C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?** The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes. The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
16 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits	No	There is no discussion of the data sources, their rationale for selection and limitations.		
17 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done	No	No discussion of ethical issues / safeguards - is provided in the report		
18 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors	No			
19 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.	No	The results framework of the project is used to evaluate progress but capability or robustness of the framework is not assessed.	Given the very limited description of the methodology, methods applied and data sources, plus lack of detail around evaluation criteria, this section is rated as ' not confident to act'. There is some attention to gender in the evaluation but no use is made of a more comprehensive approach to human rights. There is very limited discussion of methodological limitations.	Evaluation reports should be required to present a robust methodology.
20 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.	Almost			
21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender & child rights) frameworks? UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.	Almost	The evaluation does not consider the monitoring of human rights based approaches explicitly, though the monitoring of gender is addressed through its importance as an issue for project design. The methodology is partially able to analyse gender and human rights issues. There is some - though not comprehensive or systematic - capacity in the methodology for addressing the gender issues raised in the project design.		
22 Do the analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide adequate information on human rights (inc. women & child rights) aspects? The inclusion of human rights and gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned.	Almost			

(Column note spanning questions 19–22:) **Not Confident to Act**

23 Is the methodology appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the scope? If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of social exclusion, disparities & equity.	Almost	
24 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.	Yes	The levels of stakeholder participation are explained and justified, and are appropriate for this evaluation.
25 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.	Yes	
26 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.	N/A	Based on lesson learning rather than the construction of the counterfactual.
27 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.	Almost	The methodology does mainly enable answers to the questions - which are broad and largely formative in nature - though an expanded methodology e.g. to assess efficiency would be useful.
28 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings	Almost	There is only very limited discussion of methodological limitations, scattered within the findings sections.
Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The description of the methodology is very limited, as are methods applied and data sources used, which is related to the lack of detail around evaluation criteria. There is some attention to gender in the evaluation but there is no use of a more comprehensive approach to human rights and there is very limited discussion of methodological limitations.	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
29 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Yes	Findings are clearly presented and are derived from the evidence. They are also reported upon at the different levels of results using the project's own results framework, though the focus is heavily at output level.		
30 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes	The findings respond to the key questions of the evaluation and there is a logical progression to results (mainly output level). The discussion of gaps and limitations are mainly centred around project implementation / achievement, but are clearly reported upon.		
31 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes		Findings do respond directly to the evaluation questions and are clearly grounded in the evidence. There is a progression from implementation to results (though mainly at output level). There has been no comprehensive cost analysis. Conclusions add some (though not considerable) value to the findings and are generally reasonably balanced.	Cost analysis could be a requirement for evaluations where the evaluation is intended to inform project continuation.
32 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes			
33 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	N/A	There are no unexpected findings reported upon. The financial basis of the project is set out but costs have not been analysed where they could have been.		
34 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.	No			
35 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.	Almost	The evaluation implicitly - rather than explicitly - assigns contributions for results to different stakeholders but this is not systematic. The conclusions of the report were written by the broad group of stakeholders in the evaluation so it can be assumed that they have taken the range of views into account.		
36 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.	Yes			
37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Yes	Generally yes, the reasons for achievement or non-achievement are explained.		

Almost Confident to Act

38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.	Almost	These are embedded within the findings and are often not clearly drawn out, but some relevant analysis is present in the report.
39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.	Almost	The conclusions are fairly balanced but could comment more on the analysis of results presented at the end of the findings section. They do add some value to the findings but could be more incisive in terms of insight.
40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.	Almost	
41 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).	Yes	The conclusions were written for, and by, the stakeholders involved, so are appropriately pitched.
Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	While the findings do respond directly to the evaluation questions and are clearly grounded in the evidence, and there is a progression from implementation to results, the latter is mainly at output level. Conclusions add some (though fairly limited) value to the findings and are not fully balanced.	

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	The recommendations are mainly grounded in the findings / conclusions		
43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes	Recommendations are relevant; they are clearly stated but not prioritised		
44 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Almost			
45 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	No	The recommendations do not identify the relevant stakeholders responsible for action; most but not all are realistic though one or two may be questionable, depending on partners' constraints.	Almost Confident to Act	Recommendations are relevant and may well be actionable but are not prioritised and there are no specific attributions of responsibility. The section on lessons learned is overly generalised / at times stating the obvious.	Recommendations should be required by ToRs to be specific and prioritised, perhaps even a limited number.
46 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Almost			
47 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No	No, there is no discussion of the process of developing the recommendations.		
48 Where presented, are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	Almost	There is a specific section on lessons learned but at least two are conclusions rather than contributions to wider learning and several of the remainder are very obvious.		
49 Where presented, are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	Almost	They are generalised, but some are overly so, without any explanation of what the learning might mean for different contexts.		
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		Recommendations are relevant and appear actionable but are not prioritised and there are no specific attributions of responsibility. The section on lessons learned is overly generalised / at times stating the obvious.		

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
50. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Almost	Missing are the names and titles of the evaluators; list of acronyms;		
51. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A	No	Not included	The report is mainly logically structured but the issue is that sections such as an Executive Summary, and some of the Annexes, are missing. It does generally read well.	Evaluation reports should require an Executive Summary before being signed off.
52 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	N/A	N/A		
53 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	N/A			
54 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	N/A			
55 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes	The structure is broadly logical		
56 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Almost	The annexes listed at the start of the report (not all supplied) contain many though not all of the required elements - data collection instruments, list of site visits, etc would be helpful.		
57 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Almost			
58 Is the style of the report human rights compliant? This includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups	Almost	There is attention to gender, poverty and exclusion issues but this is not comprehensive or systematic.		

Overall column rating (vertical): **Almost Confident to Act**

Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The report is mainly logically structured but sections such as an Executive Summary, and some of the Annexes, are missing, though it generally reads well.**

Additional Information

Question	Remarks
i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	No ToR provided - this should be a requirement for all evaluations in future.
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The comprehensive description of the object and context could be considered good practice.
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	There appears to have been good practice in terms of multi-stakeholder working.

OVERALL RATING

Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Almost	There could be only partial confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements; while the evidence base is reasonable and the findings / conclusions / lessons learned are grounded in the evidence, there are some quality concerns around the depth and scale of these.	**Almost Confident to Act** — The report is credible in terms of its limited aims but the lack of a comprehensive description of the methodology constrains its validity and wider relevance. Findings are well grounded in evidence, but conclusions add only limited value, as do lessons learned identified.
ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Yes	There is a clear logical flow and consistency of analysis.	
iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.		The lack of the methodology section - cited as being present in an Annex but not provided - could explain some of the methodological limitations.	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	With a little more work, this report could be satisfactory. It has a reasonable evidence base from which findings and conclusions are logically derived, but lacks a comprehensive description of the methodology (which constrains its validity and wider relevance). Conclusions and lessons learned add only limited value and a rights based approach could be more systematically employed.		