Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation: Evaluation of the Rapid Response to Population Movement (RRMP) Mechanism based on Performance

Sequence No: 2018/003
Region: WCAR
Office: Democratic Republic of Congo
Coverage: Democratic Republic of Congo
Evaluation Type: Programme
Year of Report: 2018

OVERALL RATING

Satisfactory

Implications: Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

The report is strong at describing the RRMP initiative, including its historical and current implementation status, its location and cost. However, whereas the report describes the overall needs of beneficiaries that were addressed by RRMP, the specific characteristics of the different beneficiary groups are not fully described. Similarly, the report only dedicates a paragraph to discussing the overall context in DRC and does not provide enough detail about the socioeconomic and political situation in the country. On the other hand, the report describes the historical involvement of UNICEF in the DRC and its partnerships with other UN agencies, INGOs and other implementation partners. Similarly, the roles and contributions of key implementing partners, including those of UNICEF, are discussed. Finally, the report provides a good explanation of the intervention’s intended results, (a summarized logframe of results is provided in Annex 2), and a Theory of Change is provided that clearly lists the strategies, inputs, outcomes and expected impact, along with risks and assumptions.

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

Satisfactory

The report clearly indicates that the purpose of the evaluation is both summative and formative and it fulfills both learning and accountability purposes. The intended use of the evaluation and the primary and secondary intended users are also clearly established. Finally, whereas the report indicates the scope in terms of programmatic, chronological, and geographic coverage, the choices made in this regard and the reasons that justify this particular scope as compared to the total coverage of the initiative are not discussed.
SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

• • • – Satisfactory

The report presents a clear scope of analysis that is aligned with the OECD/DAC standard criteria and cross-cutting criteria. Furthermore, the report provides a very complete description of the specific areas of inquiry associated to each evaluation criterion and a full evaluation matrix that indicates evaluation questions, data collection tools, and data sources is presented. The evaluation also describes all of the data collection instruments used and a rationale is provided for the utilization of each method. A description of the data analysis methods and triangulation of different levels of evidence is also presented. Furthermore, the report provides a list of methodological and operational limitations that are paired with mitigation strategies in each case. Finally, the report provides a description of the ethical safeguards applied during the conduct of the evaluation and the ethical obligations of the evaluators are explicitly listed. However, although interviews with children were conducted, the report does not make reference to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

• • • • Highly Satisfactory

The report presents findings that are supported by abundant evidence and that provide analysis of the initiative’s successes and shortcomings. Also, the way in which the findings are presented is particularly clear since they respond to key evaluation questions, present an outline of key findings in each case and are organized according to the corresponding evaluation criteria. Furthermore, the occurrence of unintended positive and negative effects are duly noted and analyzed in finding 7. Finally, the report does a particularly good job of assessing the existing M&E system and provides a complete analysis as to the way it was used to make decisions regarding the RRMP as well as the aspects where the said system could be improved.

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

• • • – Satisfactory

The report presents conclusions that are logically derived from the information and evidence presented in the findings. Furthermore, the conclusions add an extra layer of analysis and are conveniently presented around the evaluation criteria, which facilitates their comprehension. On the other hand, conclusions do not sufficiently integrate a forward-looking perspective to the information presented so as to signify their foreseeable implications for future programming. Finally, the report correctly formulates lessons learned that successfully identify elements that are useful and applicable to other programmes and contexts.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

• • • – Satisfactory
The report presents recommendations that are correctly drawn from the findings and conclusions, and they are clearly presented according to their level of priority. Recommendations are realistic and provide sufficient detail to guide their implementation, They also clearly identify the specific target group for action. However, although the report mentions in the stakeholder analysis (annex 3) that some stakeholders were consulted in the formulation of the recommendations, the process followed in developing the recommendations and a rationale for the particular level of stakeholder involvement is not described.

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

- Satisfactory

The report follows a logical structure and includes clearly indicated sections and sub sections that follow each other according to the standard order for this type of report. Also, the opening pages contain most of the necessary elements to readily inform end-users, including the name of the object of the evaluation, the names of the evaluators, the commissioning organization, submission date, table of contents, list of acronyms, etc. However, the table of contents does not faithfully list the page numbers and the timeframe of the evaluation is not stated. On the other hand, the annexes are very complete and they include the ToRs, evaluation matrix, list of interviewed people, data collection instruments, and information on the evaluators, among others.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

- Satisfactory

The report states that the evaluation was guided by the Human Rights-based Approach (HRBA) to programming and evaluation and consistent reference to child rights is made throughout the report. The report presents a stakeholder analysis (annex 3), which specifies the roles played by key stakeholders in the evaluation beyond that of informants. However, there is no mention of the existence of an evaluation reference group. Similarly, the scope of the evaluation is not detailed enough as to specify the different rights-holder groups and the report could have provided more information as to the needs of different beneficiary groups. On the other hand, the report presents a very complete assessment of the ways in which equity and gender considerations guided the design and implementation of the initiative. The scope of analysis includes cross-cutting issues and several evaluation questions inquire about the gender dimension of the initiative. Similarly, the methodology specifies the ways in which the evaluation integrated a gender perspective in the data collection tools and methods as well as in the data analysis methods used. Finally, the findings, conclusions and recommendations present a complete gender analysis and the way this particular initiative has affected gender dynamics is extensively addressed.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

- Satisfactory
The report is preceeded by an executive summary that presents all of the most important elements in order to clearly inform end users about the initiative and the evaluation carried out. The executive summary is relevant and complete and it only introduces information that is developed in further detail in the body of the report. On the other hand, the executive summary is too lengthy (11 pages) and it exceeds by far the recommended length to effectively inform high-level users.

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Meets requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations for improvement

This is a high quality report that can be used with confidence by decision-makers as it presents robust and useful findings as well as recommendations. The report also features a robust methodology and observes good practices in the inclusion of gender and equity considerations. In the future, it may be useful to establish an Evaluation Reference Group in order to guide and assist the evaluation team in the conduct of the evaluation. Additionally, it would be useful for the Evaluation Manager to insist that the Executive Summary remain within a reasonable length (5 - 6 pages). Finally, the Evaluation Manager could, in the future, provide greater support to the evaluation team around how to draft forward-looking conclusions. Stakeholder participation in this may be useful.

### Lessons for managing future evaluations:

GEROS standards require evaluation reports to present a clear description of the intended beneficiaries, which would include the number of beneficiaries (actual or estimated) as well as their main characteristics, i.e. age, ethnic groups, health condition, rural or urban origin, etc. Differences between groups of beneficiaries should also be highlighted for equity purposes. Also, it is recommended to present a succinct overview of the general socioeconomic, political and institutional context surrounding the initiative in order to provide the reader with a clearer understanding of the conditions in which the initiative took place.

### Section A

Good practices suggest that evaluation reports justify why a particular scope was selected as compared to the total coverage of the initiative. The rationale used for the choices made in this regard should be explained so as to provide assurance that the evaluation faithfully assessed relevant and representative aspects of the initiative.

### Section B

In order to comply with GEROS standards, it is required that whenever interviews with children are conducted, the report explicitly reference the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.

### Section C

The findings section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

### Section D

Since this is also a formative evaluation, conclusions should convey a forward-looking perspective and clearly indicate any foreseeable implications of the findings on future programming.

### Section E

It is important that the process followed in developing and validating the recommendations be clearly described. Also, good practices recommend that a rationale be presented as to why a particular level of stakeholder participation was chosen. Stakeholder involvement in developing and/or validating recommendations helps to make them more realistic, useful, and actionable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section G</th>
<th>It is recommended that the table of contents be revised so that it reflects the actual page numbers. Also, the opening pages should present all of the necessary elements to readily inform end-users about the initiative including the timeframe that has been evaluated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section H</td>
<td>It is recommended that the evaluation be guided by an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) that assists the evaluation team throughout the conduct of the evaluation. This ERG should be conformed by key stakeholders that actively participated in the implementation of the initiative. Also, it is important that the report specify the different beneficiary groups that were reached by the initiative so as to then make it possible to determine to what extent these different rights-holder groups should be included in the scope of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I</td>
<td>In addition to being as complete as possible, it is important that the executive summary be concise. Good practices recommend that the executive summary not exceed 4-5 pages in order to effectively inform high-level users who may not have time to read a longer document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>