Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation: The Evaluation of Meshwary Project Phase II

Sequence No: 2017/001

Region: MENA

Office: Egypt

Coverage: Egypt

Evaluation Type: Project

Year of Report: 2017

OVERALL RATING

Satisfactory

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

Lessons for future evaluations:

It is essential that the report explain to what extent stakeholders were involved in the evaluation process. Evaluations should be participatory in nature and should include stakeholders not only as sources of information but also to help guide and provide input into the evaluation process. The evaluation should ideally be guided by an Evaluation Reference Group made up of key project stakeholders, and evaluation findings and recommendations should be validated by stakeholders through a Stakeholder Validation Meeting or some similar mechanism. For more information on how to conduct participatory evaluations, please see: http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/participatory_evaluation.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

The project is well described, including its interventions and anticipated results. The programming context is also well outlined. However, the report does not clearly indicate what contributions (financial or otherwise) UNICEF provided nor does it clearly identify the contributions of the project's other stakeholders.

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

Satisfactory

The evaluation scope is very well defined, including who will use the information generated by the evaluation and for what aims. The report also clearly identifies the evaluation objectives and the evaluation scope. The report does not, however, mention whether any changes were made to the initial ToRs.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

This evaluation is based on a strong mixed methods methodology that allows for adequate triangulation between data sources. The report is particularly strong at describing the methodology and justifying its selection. Ethical issues and considerations are particularly well outlined both within the body of the report and in a corresponding annex. While methodological limitations are identified, the report does not explicitly outline mitigation strategies.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory
The evaluation findings are very strong and well crafted. They are structured around the evaluation criteria and provide sufficient evidence to analytically answer all of the evaluation questions. They draw on multiple sources of triangulated data and thoroughly investigate the causal reasons for accomplishments and failures. The findings are particularly strong at discussing unintended results. While the report provides an excellent assessment of the project's M&E system, it does not discuss how M&E data was used for decision-making.

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

Fair

The report's conclusions are exceptionally strong, as they not only provide an analytical summary of the project's primary strengths and areas for improvement, but they also provide an in-depth discussion around how the findings will likely impact the future of the intervention. Information on lessons learned is presented but is incorrectly identified and formulated. The lessons learned focus on providing a summary of the project's strengths and weaknesses. This is not what is intended by presenting lessons learned. Lessons learned should identify pieces of information that could be useful to similar projects in other programming contexts.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

The recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation findings and will likely be very useful to decision makers. The report identifies the specific audience for each recommendation and provides a very thorough description of how the recommendation could be implemented. At the same time, the recommendations are not listed in an explicit priority order, and the report does not explain whether stakeholders were involved in the development or validation of recommendations.

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

Satisfactory

The evaluation is well structured and presents all sections in a logical and standard evaluation report format. While the opening pages include all of the required information, it would be useful to put the project dates and location along with the name of the commissioning agency on the evaluation cover page. The annexes are complete and add significant credibility to the report. They include an evaluation matrix, the project's results framework, lists of data sources, information on ethics, and copies of the evaluation tools, among others.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

The evaluation is very strong at integrating an equity approach by ensuring that data collected is disaggregated by age and disadvantaged group (i.e. people with disabilities). The evaluation matrix includes specific questions relating to equity and gender equality to ensure that the evaluation assesses the extent to which the project was designed and implemented in line with these principles. Human rights, equity, and gender equality concerns are mentioned throughout the report from the background section all the way to recommendations. Regarding SWAP criteria: 1. Indicators collected sex disaggregated data; 2. Specific evaluation questions were identified to assess the extent to which the programme design and implementation addressed GEEW; 3. The methodology includes the voices of both women and men, although more men were interviewed than women; and 4. GEEW considerations are presented throughout the report from the background section to the recommendations. At the same time, the report does not explain to what extent stakeholders were involved in the evaluation process. There is no reference to an Evaluation Reference Group and the report does not mention whether the evaluation findings and recommendations were validated by stakeholders.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Highly Satisfactory
The Executive Summary provides an excellent and succinct summary of the key elements of the evaluation report. It is an appropriate length and includes all of the necessary elements (i.e. project description, information on the evaluation purpose and methodology, key findings and conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations). It will likely be very useful to decision makers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section G</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section H</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>