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## OVERALL RATING

- **Satisfactory**
  - Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

## SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

- **Satisfactory**
  - The report presents a clear description of the object of the evaluation, and the national sociopolitical, economic and institutional context is also discussed in much detail. Similarly, the relative importance of the SPCF in Eritrea is well explained as well as the implementing agencies involved in the initiative. However, the report does not address the specific contributions made by each agency or other stakeholders or those of UNICEF. Similarly, whereas the report explains the intended results of the initiative, the report does not present the framework's change logic even though this is called for in the ToRs.

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

- **Satisfactory**
  - The report correctly discusses the purpose of the evaluation which is described as to "identify what has worked, what has not and related reasons, in the specific context of Eritrea and in the particular collaborative efforts of the UNCT... and verify results achieved within the revised framework of the SPCF." Also, the report explains the intended use of the evaluation as well as its primary audience. Whereas the report discusses in detail the coverage of the evaluation in terms of chronological and thematic areas, the geographic scope of the evaluation is not duly discussed. Also, there is no discussion around the rationale for the decisions made regarding the scope.

## SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

- **Satisfactory**
The report presents the methodology used for the evaluation in a clear fashion and the evaluation framework, including evaluation criteria and key questions, is clearly presented. Similarly, the report discusses the different triangulation and cross-validation analysis methods used as well as the methodological limitations along with relevant mitigation strategies. On the other hand, the report does not sufficiently discuss the data sources and the sampling strategy, only stating that "The SPCF involved a quite complex landscape of actors across the territory and institutional structures and sectors at all levels of Eritrea..." The report does a good job at discussing the ethical safeguards used in the conduct of the evaluation and the ethical obligations of the evaluators are also clearly listed.

**SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)**

**Satisfactory**

The report does a good job at presenting findings that are supported by different levels of evidence and at highlighting both successes and challenges of the SPCF initiative. Furthermore, the report presents the findings according to the evaluation framework (per outcome) and it conveniently uses a "school grade" approach to assign different marks to the achievement of intended results or lack thereof. Also, the report does a good job at pointing to the causal factors in each findings statement and there is a complete assessment of the intervention's M&E system and the use of this system in decision-making. On the other hand, the report does not include a discussion around the unintended positive or negative effects of the intervention.

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

**Highly Satisfactory**

The report presents conclusions that are correctly drawn from the information included in the findings and that provide an added value as they shed some light on foreseeable bottlenecks in future implementation. Additionally, they do a good job at presenting both the weaknesses and strengths of the SPCF. Finally, lessons learned are correctly identified and clearly presented as well as best practices, as per the ToRs.

**SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)**

**Highly Satisfactory**

Recommendations are correctly drawn from the information presented in the findings and conclusions. Recommendations are clearly presented according to the Deliver as One principles, and indicate the target stakeholder group for action as well as the level of priority for each. Furthermore, the report clearly discusses the process followed in developing the recommendations and the level of stakeholder participation in that process.

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

**Satisfactory**
The report contains information that is clearly presented in the standard order of sections, with titles and subsections that make the document easy to navigate. The opening pages contain all of the necessary elements, i.e. name of the object of the evaluation, name of the commissioning organization; name of the evaluator; coverage of the evaluation in chronological and geographic terms; table of contents; and lists of graphs, figures and acronyms. Similarly, the information included in the annexes increases the overall credibility of the report. However, the full evaluation matrix is not presented in the report or included in the annexes.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

**Satisfactory**
The report does a good job at assessing to what extent the standard set of SPCF programming principles (i.e. human rights-based approach, equity and gender equality) were considered and mainstreamed throughout the implementation of the initiative. The report also explains in detail the specific ways the evaluation included a human-rights based, gender-equality and equity-focused perspective throughout all of the evaluation criteria. While the evaluation methodology uses mixed methods to capture the voices of both women and men, the report does not explain how the methodology was specifically designed to take gender equality issues into consideration. Finally, the findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a consistent gender analysis.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

**Satisfactory**
The report includes an executive summary that is concise (4 pages), and for the most part effectively informs end users of the main aspects of the evaluation. However, the executive summary could provide some additional information on the SPCF initiative itself, including a brief overview of its main activities, in order to help decision makers to have a better understanding of the object of the evaluation. Finally, all of the elements presented in the executive summary are developed in further detail in the core of the report.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

| 8 | Meets requirements |

Recommendations for improvement

- This is a high quality evaluation report that can be used with confidence by end users. It uses a robust methodology, presents clear findings supported by different levels of evidence, and provides useful lessons learned and recommendations. For future evaluations, it is important to clearly identify and assess any unexpected results emerging from the intervention. This is especially the case if they are called for in the ToRs (as they were for this evaluation under review). It is also good practice to include the full evaluation matrix as a report annex. These are important elements to include in future evaluations and their presence should be ensured by the evaluation manager.

Lessons for managing future evaluations:

-
### Section A
It is good practice for all evaluations to explain the object of evaluation's change logic. Ideally, this is done both in writing and through a graphic representation. In the case of this evaluation, it is particularly important since it was called for in the ToRs. If the object of evaluation does not already have a Theory of Change, it is good practice for evaluators to recreate one for the purpose of guiding the evaluation assessment. To learn more about how to construct a Theory of Change model, please see: [http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resource/guide/purposeful_program_theory](http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resource/guide/purposeful_program_theory)

### Section B
It is recommended that the report discuss all areas of scope, including the geographic coverage of the evaluation, and the rationale for these decisions.

### Section C
It is important to present a detailed sampling strategy and the rationale for the choices made regarding the data sources to ensure its representability and avoidance of bias.

### Section D
It is good practice to include a discussion around the occurrence of unintended positive or negative effects, especially considering that this was also required in the ToRs. An analysis of the unintended effects of an initiative can shed light on important issues around future programming.

### Section E
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

### Section F
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

### Section G
It is important to include the full evaluation matrix with all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions, etc. When this is not included in the core of the report (only abbreviated version), the full-fledged evaluation matrix should be presented as an annex.

### Section H
Even though the methodology ensured that both women and men's voices were heard, the report does not outline any particular efforts to make the methodology gender sensitive. For instance, gender sensitive methodologies are often designed to minimize power dynamics between men and women and to ensure that women are specifically empowered to participate in the evaluation process. To learn more about using gender sensitive methodologies, please see: [http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook](http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook)

### Section I
It is important to provide a succinct overview of the SPCF initiative in order to provide a better understanding of the object of the evaluation.