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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:

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

• • • • Satisfactory

The report presents a description of the sociopolitical context surrounding the initiative. However, the way it relates to the initiative could be further developed. The object of the evaluation is clearly explained, including time and location, current status of the programme, primary beneficiaries and their main characteristics and needs, etc. Also, the report presents an explanation of the importance that the intervention has for UNICEF considering its involvement in the DPRK throughout the last decade. The evaluators present a ToC whose graphic representation is presented in Annex 5. However, the report does not include a verbal explanation of the results chain, which would add value. Finally, main stakeholders and their respective roles and contributions, including UNICEF's, are duly discussed.

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

• • • • Highly Satisfactory

The report discusses the purpose of the evaluation, which appears realistic and is clearly stated as to undertake a comprehensive assessment of all of the components of the current CMAM programme; to identify key achievements, challenges and lessons learned; and to identify practical and realistic recommendations. Furthermore, the report presents a clear explanation of the scope of the evaluation in terms of time period, geographical coverage, as well as its main focus. Also, the report refers to changes made to the ToRs and presents a rationale for these modifications. Finally, the report clearly indicates both the evaluation's intended primary and secondary users as well as the way these stakeholders plan to use the evaluation.
SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation uses OECD/DAC standard criteria and includes cross-cutting principles of gender equality, equity and human rights in line with UNICEF evaluation priorities. The report also describes a set of methods of analysis and triangulation used among different levels of evidence and provides a rationale for the sources of information and the sampling strategy. A detailed evaluation matrix with specific evaluation questions is presented in annex 8. Also, the report presents the challenges and constraints faced by the evaluation, providing a mitigation strategy in each case. Finally, the evaluation does a good job at discussing the obligations of the evaluators and the ethical safeguards used to protect participants.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory
The report presents findings that respond to key evaluation questions and follow the evaluation framework. Also, the evaluation addresses both positive and negative findings which are supported by several lines of evidence and the report provides causal factors that explain success or challenges encountered. Similarly, the evaluation report makes reference to the initiative's M&E system, as per the ToRs, provides an analysis of the use of M&E data, and presents recommendations on the way this system could be improved during future programming. Finally, the evaluation the report presents some discussion around the occurrence of unintended effects, although these are not sufficiently explored and analysed.

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

Highly Satisfactory
The report presents conclusions that provide summarized information about the most important findings and that include further insight and a deeper analysis of the evidence presented, including a description of future challenges. Furthermore, the conclusions are clearly presented and they address all of the evaluation criteria. Also, lessons learned are correctly identified and clearly stated.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory
The recommendations are clearly drawn from the findings and conclusions and they are useful to primary and secondary users of the evaluation as they clearly state the way the recommendations are to be implemented. The report explains the process followed in developing the recommendations as well as the way stakeholders participated in this process. Recommendations are clearly presented, numbered according to their priority level and identify the stakeholders to whom they are addressed.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)
**Highly Satisfactory**
The evaluation report follows a logical structure and presents the information with clarity, using numbered sections and subsections, which makes the evaluation report easy to navigate. Also, the report is an ideal and accessible length and includes all necessary supporting information in the annexes such as the ToRs, the evaluation matrix, copies of the methodological tools, etc, which greatly increase the overall credibility of the report. Finally, the opening pages present all relevant elements to adequately inform the intended users about the most important aspects of the intervention and the evaluation.

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

**Satisfactory**
The evaluation discusses that the initiative used an approach that took into consideration the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The level of stakeholder involvement in the different stages of the evaluation and their particular involvement regarding the development of recommendations are duly addressed. The evaluation also addresses questions of equity and makes some attempts to mainstream GEEW as a cross-cutting issue throughout the evaluation report. However, GEEW could be much better addressed and mainstreamed.

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

**Highly Satisfactory**
The Executive Summary is concise and includes all necessary information to adequately inform decision-makers about the intervention and the evaluation process. It presents an overview of the intervention, a brief explanation of the evaluation and its main objectives, along with the main findings and recommendations. All the information presented in the executive summary is further developed in the core of the report.

---

**Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations for improvement**

This evaluation largely observes good practices and can be used with confidence by decision-makers. It is based on a sound methodology, presents grounded findings, and identifies useful conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. This being said, the report could better mainstream GEEW throughout. This could potentially be done by using a specific gender-equality evaluation criterion and gender sensitive evaluation questions to enquire into the way gender was addressed during the programme design and implementation; by using an evaluation methodology that clearly indicates the way the evaluation included women and ensured that their perspectives were captured throughout the entire evaluation process; and by consistently integrating a gender analysis throughout the different sections of the evaluation report.

**Lessons for managing future evaluations:**

- Ensure that gender sensitivity is incorporated throughout the evaluation process.
- Use specific evaluation criteria to address gender equality issues.
- Consistently integrate gender analysis in all sections of the evaluation report.
It is good practice to discuss in detail the sociopolitical context in which the intervention took place and to explicitly address the way in which the context relates to the programme design and implementation. Similarly, along with a graphic representation of the ToC, it is useful to provide a written description of the programme's change logic, including the way that outputs relate to the outcomes and the differences between short-term and long-term outcomes.

The findings observe for the most part good practices. However, it can add great value to the evaluation to include an intentional analysis of the occurrence of unintended positive and negative effects during the implementation of the programme. A discussion around the unintended effects of an intervention can help to identify what can be improved or done differently in future programming.

It can be helpful to integrate GEEW within the scope of analysis by including a particular evaluation criterion on gender equality in order to explicitly analyse the extent to which the programme observed a GEEW-mainstreaming approach throughout its implementation. Also, the methodological tools and data analysis should include a description of how women's voices were included in the evaluation. Finally, it is important that the evaluation's findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a consistent gender analysis. For more information on how to include a gender analysis in an evaluation, please visit https://www.betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/gender_analysis

The Executive Summary observes good practices. No further improvement is required.