

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version 2018.1

Reviewers: complete all cells highlighted in Yellow

		Notes for QA
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation of innovation in UNICEF work. Evaluation Synthesis Report	
Report sequence number	2018/014	
Region	HQ	
Year of Report	2018	
Office	Evaluation Office	
Coverage (countries)	Global	
ToRs present	Yes	
Date of Review	17/03/2019	
Name of reviewer	ImpactReady	
Classification of Evaluation Report		
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)		UNICEF managed
SPOA Correspondence <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	Health	Yes
	HIV/AIDS	Yes
	WASH	Yes
	Nutrition	Yes
	Education	Yes
	Child protection	Yes
	Social inclusion	Yes
	Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
	Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes
Evaluation object		Thematic area
Evaluation type		Summative and formative
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods

Evaluation design		Other
Evaluation level		Outcome
Geographic Scope		Multi-region/Global
SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		67%
Question 1.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	100%
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	Yes
	Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	Not Rated
	Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)	Yes
Question 2.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	33%
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	Partly
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	Not Rated
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	Partly
Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	Not Rated
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	Not Rated
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	Not Rated
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	Not Rated
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	Not Rated
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	Not Rated
••••	Executive Feedback on Section A	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of how UNICEF's approach to innovation has evolved over time. Additionally, the importance of innovation within UNICEF is explicitly outlined, as the report explains how UNICEF has made innovation a corporate priority. Even so, the background section is quite light (only one page long) and does not provide descriptions of what kinds of innovation are included under the heading "innovation" (this information is provided under the section 'evaluation scope'). Finally, the context (both within the organisation and within the larger development sphere) surrounding UNICEF's innovation work and how the context has affected its work is not discussed within the background section. While this information is somewhat integrated within the findings, it is good practice to provide a summary of the context at the beginning of the report to prepare the reader for the findings to come.</p>		 3
Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting

<p>It is expected that evaluation reports will provide some contextual information near the beginning to help the reader to understand within what kind of context the object of evaluation is operating. In this case, it would have been useful to understand any contextual elements (both within UNICEF and outside) that may have an overall influence on its innovation work.</p>		0.05
<p>SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</p>		83%
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	67%
	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve	Mostly
	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation	Mostly
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	100%
	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR	Yes
	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention)	Yes
•••	Executive Feedback on Section B	Overall rating for Section
<p>The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements</p>		Satisfactory
<p>The report identifies the evaluation's two-fold purpose around learning and accountability and explains how UNICEF's internal staff will be the primary users. However, the report does not provide a more detailed breakdown as to how different units or levels within UNICEF are expected to use the evaluation findings and recommendations for different purposes. The evaluation scope is nicely outlined and includes definitions of the thematic elements included within the evaluation scope.</p>		 3
<p>Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)</p>		Weighting
<p>It is good practice to break down evaluation users into smaller groups in order to generate more precision around how different groups are expected to use the evaluation findings and recommendations for different purposes. For instance, COs will likely use the evaluation differently than the OoI at HQ. By identifying these different uses from the beginning, evaluators are better placed to make more useful and targeted recommendations.</p>		0.05
<p>SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</p>		47%

Question 7.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	67%
	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation	Mostly
	If the framework is OTHER than UNICEF standard criteria, or if not all standard criteria of the chosen framework are included, the reasons for this are clearly explained and the chosen framework is clearly described	Not Rated
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	75%
	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope	Mostly
	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated	Yes
	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?	Partly
	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?	Yes
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:	0%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	No
	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm)	No
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	Not Rated
• • • •	Executive Feedback on Section C	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair

<p>The evaluation uses a non-standard evaluation design that combines an organisational assessment with country-specific case studies, drawing on mixed methods. While this design appears to be appropriate to meet the evaluation objectives, the report does not provide an explicit justification for why this design was chosen. The report states that the evaluation followed standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (with the inclusion of equity) and presents key evaluation questions. However, the questions are not organised according to the evaluation criteria and it is unclear how the questions address the criteria.</p> <p>Additionally, the evaluation does not include an evaluation matrix and therefore the indicators used to guide the assessment to answer each evaluation question is a bit unclear.</p> <p>Data collection methods and sampling are clearly outlined. While the report mentions triangulation, it does not provide a very rigorous discussion around the other ways data was analysed, especially concerning the analysis around contributions towards outcome and impact level results. Evaluation limitations are identified and mitigation approaches are discussed, where feasible. While the evaluation report specifies that the UNICEF Evaluation Office is responsible for ensuring that evaluations meet UNEG Ethical Standards, the report provides no description as to how the evaluation was executed in line with these standards.</p>	 <p>2</p>
--	--

<p>Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)</p>	<p>Weighting</p>
<p>The evaluation framework could be further strengthened in terms of clarity if the evaluation questions were more explicitly aligned with the evaluation criteria. This could be done by simply adding a reference next to each evaluation question to identify to which evaluation criterion it corresponds. Additionally, it is good practice to include a full evaluation matrix with assessment indicators to increase transparency around the metrics guiding the assessment of each evaluation question. A more in-depth discussion around how outcome and impact level results were assessed would also add value to the report. Even though the evaluation design is strong and appears to be relevant in meeting the evaluation objectives, the evaluation report should explicitly justify the selected design. Finally, GERO standards require all UNICEF evaluation reports to explicitly discuss how evaluators upheld their ethical responsibilities and what ethical safeguards were put in place to protect evaluation participants (even if those participants are UNICEF staff). To learn more about UN ethical standards in evaluation, please see the UNEG Ethical Guidelines at: http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102.</p>	<p>0.15</p>

<p>SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)</p>	<p>89%</p>
---	------------

<p>Question 10.</p>	<p>Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?</p>	<p>67%</p>
	<p>Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria</p>	<p>Mostly</p>
	<p>Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings</p>	<p>Not Rated</p>
<p>Question 11.</p>	<p>Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.</p>	<p>100%</p>
	<p>The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed</p>	<p>Not Rated</p>
	<p>The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Question 12.</p>	<p>Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?</p>	<p>100%</p>

	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic; M&E tools and their usage)	Yes
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	Yes
•••-	Executive Feedback on Section D	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Satisfactory
	The findings are based on abundant evidence and present both the positive and negative elements of UNICEF's innovation work. Causal factors are well outlined, and the report provides a strong assessment of how UNICEF is monitoring innovation and using this information for decision-making. While it appears as though most of the evaluation questions are well answered, it is difficult to be sure since the findings do not make any reference to the evaluation questions or the evaluation criteria.	 3
	Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	It would be easier for the reader to follow the evaluation assessment within its established framework if the findings were presented according to the evaluation criteria and guiding questions. Since the report took an alternative approach, it would have been useful to see how references to the evaluation framework could still have been made within the findings section.	0.2

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)	56%
---	------------

Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	78%
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly
	Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase)	Mostly
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	Yes
Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	33%
	Correctly identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	Partly

•••-	Executive Feedback on Section E	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair
	The conclusions are logically derived from the findings but do not provide a consistent analysis that indicates the high level issues to be considered. They present a lot of detailed data (including survey data) that is usually too detailed to be referred to in the conclusions. They also do not consistently highlight the implications of the findings for the future. Lessons learned are not presented in a separate section but are scattered informally throughout the findings.	 2
	Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting

The report could be strengthened by editing the conclusions so as to more clearly bring out the high level issues to be considered and to provide more of a discussion around the implications of the findings for the future. While the OA may not have had the opportunity to identify lessons learned, there were likely numerous lessons learned that were identified through the case studies that would have been interesting to highlight in the synthesis report. To learn more about how to effectively present lessons learned, please see: https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/lessons_learned.

0.15

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	78%
--	-----

Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	89%
--------------	--	-----

	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	Yes
	Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation)	Mostly
	Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation	Yes

Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	67%
--------------	--	-----

	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	Mostly
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Mostly

••••	Executive Feedback on Section F	Overall rating for Section
------	--	----------------------------

The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Satisfactory
---	---------------------

The evaluation provides three recommendations that are logically derived from the findings and conclusions. They generally provide enough information on how to make them actionable but could be further strengthened by providing more information around how they could in reality be implemented. Additionally, the recommendations are targeted towards UNICEF but do not specify which groups within UNICEF should be responsible for their implementation. This makes the lines of accountability somewhat blurred and makes it more difficult for UNICEF to provide a management response and to go ahead with their implementation. While the recommendations are numbered, the report does not specify whether they are presented in priority order and does not indicate the level of urgency in addressing each one. Finally, the report is strong at describing how the stakeholders were involved in the development of the recommendations, therefore increasing their ownership of them.	 3
--	---

Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
--	-----------

The recommendations could be further strengthened by providing more detailed information around how they can be implemented, by identifying the group within UNICEF that should be responsible for each one's implementation (or partial implementation), and by identifying the level of urgency in addressing each one.	0.15
---	------

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	58%
---	-----

Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	50%
--------------	--	-----

	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes-; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers	Mostly
	Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s)	Partly
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	67%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles)	Partly
	Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section G	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair
	The evaluation report is logically structured and easy to read. However, the report does not contain any findings statements, which makes it more difficult for the reader to grasp the main messages within the findings section. Also, the findings are not structured around the evaluation criteria or evaluation questions, making it difficult to see how the information presented addresses the criteria and questions. Additionally, the report is too long at 87 pages, which reduces its accessibility to stakeholders. The opening pages include most of the information required to understand the evaluation. However, the evaluation timeframe is not clearly stated prior to presenting the Executive Summary. Additionally, the list of tables and figures does not reference any page numbers. The stand-alone case studies report as well as the Organisational Assessment (OA) report are included as annexes, along with the individual case studies for each case study country. However, some important information that is expected within the annexes is missing, such as interview protocols for FGDs and KIIs and an evaluation matrix.	 2
Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
	The report would likely be easier for the reader to navigate if it made reference to the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and if it used clear findings statements. Additionally, the body of the report should be further synthesized to no more than 60 pages to encourage accessibility among stakeholders. This could be done by 1) further editing the text and tightening the writing; and 2) moving some of the information (especially from the methodology section) to the annexes. Additionally, Geros standards require that the evaluation time period be clearly indicated within the report's opening pages. The list of tables and figures should also include page numbers. Finally, the annexes should include the interview protocols for FGDs and KIIs as well as an evaluation matrix. These are essential elements to include within evaluation report annexes.	0.05
SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)		89%
Question 19.	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?	100%
	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation	Yes

	Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)	Yes
	Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.	Yes
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	100%
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	Yes
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	Yes
	Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children	Not Rated
	Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the ToRs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.)	Yes
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Approaches requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	6
UN-SWAP criterion 1:	GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW related data will be collected	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	A gender responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points
UN-SWAP criterion 3:	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points
••••	Executive Feedback on Section H	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater should include one labelled sentence for each of the UN-SWAP criteria.	Satisfactory
	The evaluation places UNICEF's work within a child rights framework and grounds UNICEF's innovation work within its larger equity and gender equality principles. The evaluation scope includes a question that investigates the extent to which UNICEF's approach to innovation supports its equity agenda (including gender equality), the methodology collects data on gender, and gender is discussed throughout the findings and conclusions. The evaluation is particularly strong at articulating how stakeholders were involved in the evaluation management, the validation of information, and the development of recommendations.	 3
	Additional justifications for UN-SWAP ratings	
UN-SWAP criterion 1:	The evaluation scope includes a question that investigates the extent to which UNICEF's approach to innovation supports its equity agenda (including gender equality). Due to the absence of an evaluation matrix, it is impossible to know whether gender was mainstreamed throughout the indicators of the other questions.	
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	The methodology collects data on gender. However, the report does not make any reference to special gender friendly methodological tools used in this evaluation.	

UN-SWAP criterion 3:	There report includes a light gender analysis within the findings and conclusions.
Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)	
<p>The evaluation satisfactorily addresses gender equality. However, the methodology could have been pushed even further to be more explicitly gender sensitive. To learn more about gender sensitive evaluation, please consult: http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook</p>	

Weighting

0.15

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	56%
---	-----

Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	56%
	An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users	Partly
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	Mostly
	Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report	Mostly

••••	Executive Feedback on Section I	Overall rating for Section
-------------	--	----------------------------

The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair
---	-------------

<p>The Executive Summary provides a good overview of most of the key elements within the body of the report. However, while "conclusions" are presented, they are in fact more in line with findings. The high-level, analytical and forward-looking elements of the conclusions are generally not highlighted. This somewhat reduces the utility of the Executive Summary to managers since they are likely interested in understand the more analytical elements of the report. While the Executive Summary provides a considerable amount of valuable information, is considerably too long (10 pages), which risks making it less accessible to senior managers who likely do not have time to read more than 5 - 6 pages. It is quite wordy and includes a lot of detail that is not necessarily required. In fact, it copies and pastes several sections directly from the body of the report as opposed to re-writing a more synthesized version.</p>	 2
--	--

Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
To improve the quality of the Executive Summary, it could be restructured to include a brief overview of the main findings and then a separate conclusions section that provides a more high-level, analytical, and forward-looking discussion. To make the Executive Summary more accessible to senior management, it should be carefully edited to make it more succinct and so that it can fit within a 6-page limit.		0.05

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)		
••••	Satisfactory	 2.6
Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence		
Lessons for improving the management and performance of future evaluations		

This evaluation report represents a notable effort by the UNICEF Evaluation Office to evaluate a less traditional object of evaluation. By commissioning this evaluation, important information has been gathered to inform UNICEF's strategic thinking and planning around innovation. Because of the important role this evaluation played around generating information, it is too bad that the conclusions did not provide a clearer discussion around the high level issues to be considered and the implications of the findings on the future, and that lessons learned from the case studies were not clearly presented and discussed within the synthesis report. Overall, this evaluation drew on a strong methodology and presented well founded findings. However, some mandatory GEROS elements were missing (for instance, a discussion around evaluation ethics) that could easily have been included in the report. In the future, the evaluation manager should make sure to share the GEROS guidelines with the evaluators and conduct a quality assurance exercise to ensure that all of the mandatory GEROS requirements are addressed by the report. Finally, even for large corporate evaluations, it is important that the evaluation report and Executive Summary remain accessible to stakeholders and senior managers with limited time available to read long reports. In the future, the evaluation manager should insist upon a maximum length of no more than 60 pages and encourage the evaluators to further edit and synthesise their writing and include any non-essential elements within the annexes.