

EVALUATION ID

0510-2012/009

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Mostly Satisfactory	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding, best practice	Highly Satisfactory	Mostly Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section

The Cornerstone Questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

[UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System](#)

[UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#)

[UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards](#)

Response	
Title of the Evaluation Report	Bolivian Health Sector Support programme - PASS - End-of-Project Evaluation
Report sequence number	2012/009
Date of Review	08/02/2013
Year of the Evaluation Report	2012
Region	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office
Country	Bolivia
Type of Report	Evaluation
ToR Present	No
Name of reviewer	Universalia
Classification of Evaluation Report	
	Comments
Geographical (Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)	1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)	2.7 Externally managed: An external organization manages the evaluation, where UNICEF is one of the organizations being assessed (UN and non-UN)
Purpose (<i>Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être</i>)	3.7 programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives
Result (<i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i>)	4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme
MTSP Correspondence (<i>Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights</i>)	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (1. Young child survival & development)
Level of Independence (<i>Implementation and control of the evaluation activities</i>)	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.
	The programme being evaluated focused on the Bolivian health sector and especially on child and maternal health broadly understood.
	While the programme was national in scope, it particularly focused on three of Bolivia's nine departments: Beni, Pando and Oruro. The evaluation's field visits were concentrated in those three departments.
	The evaluation was externally managed by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

Stage	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme	
-------	---	--

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Object and context			
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	Section 4 of the report describes the PASS programme in detail, including goals, approach and justification, and components of the programme; the context is also well explained and related to the PASS programme's priorities (in section 3); the findings and the context are also linked, though this element is rather more implicit and could have been stronger by being made more explicit. UNICEF's role as an implementing agency is mentioned in this introductory section, as are other partners, but the findings are not directly linked to this framework.	<p style="text-align: center;">A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</p> <p>The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Yes		
3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Mostly		
Theory of Change			
4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	Mostly	The PASS' logic model is included as an appendix (Appendix 5), and is quite clear, although it does not include the modifications made at either the design phase or during implementation (p. 6). Further, results by implementing agency would have been useful. Appropriate reference is made to the logic model in the analysis in Section 5 (Findings), but the evaluators note that the indicators were not always clearly defined for the projects' expected results.	<p style="background-color: #ffcc00; text-align: center;">Mostly Satisfactory</p> <p>The report does a good job of presenting a clear and full description of the object of the evaluation. The results framework has been included but there could be more analysis given to the lack of specificity with regard to the inputs and expected outputs/major stakeholder. Further, while the evaluation claims to use social inclusion and participatory frameworks, there is limited identification of stakeholders from a human rights perspective (e.g. duty bearers and rights holders).</p> <p>More in-depth analysis of the results framework and the implications of a weak performance framework on the programme and the evaluation. Explicit reference to duty bearers and rights holders, as well as linking findings and context more strongly would benefit future reports.</p>
Stakeholders and their contributions			
5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Mostly	Key stakeholders are clearly identified, e.g. in section 5.3.2, though rights holders and duty bearers are not identified as such (that is, the	

<p>6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint programme also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>language of HRBAP is not used). The contributions of stakeholders are also very well described, with details (including financial details) given where appropriate but UNICEF's contributions are not explicitly mentioned. The logic model could have included the various activities that the different actors were responsible for (MoH, CIDA, UNICEF, etc.).</p>		
<p>7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</p>	<p>No</p>			
Implementation Status				
<p>8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc. that have occurred - including the implications of these changes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This is an end of project evaluation, which is made clear in the evaluation report. The various phases of implementation, including changes to these over the course of the programme, are described (see for instance section 4, Highlights of PASS Implementation). Reference is also made to the fact that the results framework was created when the project was quite fluid and subsequent changes were not necessarily reflected in this performance framework.</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negative), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Whereas the context and objectives are clear and linked, information on UNICEF's contributions to this sector-wide programme are not made explicit in this CIDA-funded evaluation.</p>			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Purpose, objectives and scope				
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is very clear, as are its objectives and scope (see section 2 in particular; also section 7, where lessons arising from the programme as well as related recommendations are developed in detail). They are also realistic. Given the evaluation purposes (see section 2.1), there is very good linkage with the objective and scope.	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation? The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Yes			
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes			
Evaluation framework				
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Mostly	The evaluation refers to the fact that the evaluation criteria provided in the ToR were used for the evaluation, however, it is difficult to assess the questions in the absence of the ToR and without any further justification for the inclusion or exclusion of certain elements. The criteria used go beyond the standard OECD/DAC criteria to include criteria relevant to a multi-stakeholder, sector-wide programme - namely, joint responsibility for results, management and coordination mechanisms and risk management. Other criteria, such as gender equity, community involvement and local ownership are interesting but remain without any explicit justification.	Mostly Satisfactory The report clearly presents the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope. It also outlines the criteria for the evaluation that are reported to be based upon the ToR, though does not justify these criteria as being the most pertinent for the evaluation.	Justification of the criteria chosen would strengthen the evaluation.
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	No			
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negative), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	This section is strong other than the lack of explicit justification of the evaluation criteria chosen.			

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

Question	cc	Remarks		
Data collection			<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound? The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Mostly	<p>The various data collection methods are described in narrative form in the report and complemented by information in the evaluation plan presented in Appendix 2. Criteria used to "inspire" the selection of regions and groups of respondents were listed but the sampling methods were not explicitly mentioned. No reference was made to benchmarks. A few challenges and limitations were mentioned, including the very short timeframe in which all field work had to be carried out.</p>		
<p>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits</p>	Mostly			
Ethics				
<p>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p>	Mostly	<p>The report does not make explicit a proper engagement with potential ethical issues and considerations arising from the evaluation, nor does it give adequate consideration to ethical safeguards. It does consider ethical issues with the programme being evaluated, particularly in terms of cultural appropriateness, gender equity and community participation, though could have been more thorough in this regard. No specific reference was made to the inclusion of children or youth in the data collection process.</p>		
<p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	No			
Results Based Management			<p>ory</p> <p>The report's methodology is clearly linked to the evaluation criteria, questions and purposes (this</p>	<p>In future reports, it would be useful to more explicitly engage with ethical issues in relation</p>

<p>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?</p> <p>The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>The evaluation report includes the logic model of the programme and highlights weaknesses with it (e.g. the fact that the logic model identifies a series of indicators to measure the degree of achievement of outputs but that the monitoring of these indicators was not done systematically nor in a complete manner). Further, it mentions that while each of the projects within this project developed logical frameworks, these were not linked. More analysis could have been made of the impact of these limitations on the programme's results.</p>	<p>Mostly Satisfact</p>	<p>evaluation criteria, questions and purposes (this is particularly made clear in the evaluation matrix at the end of the report). The methodology could have been strengthened by a deeper results-based analysis of the interventions, expected results and resulting contributions of various partners to the results achieved.</p>	<p>explicitly engage with ethical issues in relation to the evaluation and the programme, as well as to consider the extent to which the evaluation was monitored through human rights frameworks and to ensure greater stakeholder participation (beyond just as informants). The application of a results-based analysis could have been deeper and more thorough.</p>
<p>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object?</p> <p>In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>				

Human Rights, Gender and Equity

20 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?

This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups

Mostly

The evaluation does not explicitly use the language of HRBAP. Its consideration of human rights specifically involves focusing upon gender equity and mainstreaming (see section 5.3.5); there is also some disaggregation of data to focus on particular groups (e.g. children - see table 5; also for targeted populations that are vulnerable - see section 5.1.3.2). It gives very little direct consideration as to whether the programme was monitored through human rights frameworks - yet there is some notice given to the fact that the programme was adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes, though with few details of how this was done (e.g. bullet 7 of section 7.1 - Operation Lessons). Some information is given on women and children in the evaluation, though this could be strengthened by incorporating more information on the context and particular situation in terms of access to quality services. Similarly, there is some information given on the achievements and limitations to work on gender equality and women's empowerment (see for instance section 5.3.2 - Community Involvement), however, the analysis could have been much deeper given the scope and breadth of the programme.

21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (incl. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks?

UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.

No

22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (incl. women & child rights)?

The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations.

No

23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?

The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.

Mostly

24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?

The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.

Mostly



Stakeholder participation		
<p>25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	Mostly	While stakeholders consulted are specified (see section 2.4 - Evaluation Methodology), there is very little evidence of stakeholder participation in the evaluation itself. There is no discussion as to whether more stakeholder participation might have been appropriate.
<p>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.</p>	No	
Methodological robustness		
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p>	No	There is no attempt to construct a counterfactual. Further, no baselines were provided for any of the results data presented. The authors of the report state that the intervention-specific performance frameworks were weak and did not link up to a results framework at the programme level. These intervention or project-specific logframes were not included nor was there any information on the inputs planned and carried out by the various partners. As such, a meaningful discussion of attribution and/or contribution was rendered impossible. This is a significant weakness of both the project and the evaluation given the multi-stakeholder design of this programme. There was admittedly very little time in which to carry out the field work for this evaluation.
<p>28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Mostly	
<p>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc.). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p>	Mostly	
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negative), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>In general, the methodology of the evaluation is fairly solid. It provided some analysis from a gender equity perspective but could not be characterised as a human rights-based or fully equity-focused evaluation.</p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Completeness and logic of findings			
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Mostly	The findings (section 5) are largely based on the reported evidence, however, there is a lack of rigour in the analysis. Reference is made to the lack of "hard figures" but then it is stated that "improved access and quality of health services to the population have, to a significant extent, been achieved." This statement is not based on clear and convincing evidence. The findings are organised by evaluation criteria and do show some progression. Gaps and limitations are similarly discussed at various points. Unexpected findings were not particularly noted.	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Mostly		
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes		
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Mostly		
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	N/A		
Cost Analysis			
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme. 	Mostly	Mostly Satisfactory	Further attention could be paid to the analysis and presentation of gaps and limitations.

Contribution and causality		
<p>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Mostly	<p>While the report does assign contribution for results to some degree, the complexity of the issues that the project sought to address, the multiple factors and actors affecting them and the weak data all mean that such contribution cannot often be clearly assigned. Causal reasons for accomplishments and failures are often identified but the linkage between this and particular results could be made much more robust (see throughout section 5 - key findings; in particular, see for instance 5.1.1.2).</p>
<p>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Mostly	
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
<p>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Yes	<p>Future implications are discussed, for instance in section 5.3.4 (see particularly the section "Risk Management"). Strengths and weaknesses of the programme are presented quite thoroughly, to some degree in section 5 (see section 5.3.4) though particularly in section 6.2. The HRBAP aspect of this could have been stronger however.</p>
<p>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Mostly	
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
<p>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Mostly	<p>The conclusions (section 6) are quite brief and are limited to a listing of factors contributing to the perceived success of the programme. They do not highlight any challenges, weaknesses or any of the issues related to the multi-stakeholder design of this programme or the lack of robust data upon which to base conclusions in terms of results achieved. The factors that are listed are useful but not complete.</p>
<p>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	No	

42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?

Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).

Mostly

Executive Feedback on Section D

Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negative), & justify rating.
Up to two sentences

Findings were well linked to the evaluation questions but could have provided a deeper analysis. The conclusions were very brief and limited to factors leading to the perceived success of the programme rather than also assessing challenges, gaps and limitations.

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			<p>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</p> <p>Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.</p> <p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.</p>	Mostly	The recommendations are relatively well-grounded in the evidence presented and are relevant to the programme. They are presented by stakeholder but not prioritized.	
<p>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object</p>	Yes		
<p>45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.</p>	Mostly		
Usefulness of recommendations			<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p> <p>The recommendations are presented by target group and lessons learned divided into 'operational' and 'programmatic' lessons.</p> <p>More information on how the recommendations were formulated (i.e. if there was any consultation or structured feedback processes) would strengthen the report. Similarly, lessons should be written with the ability to generalise in mind.</p>
<p>46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.</p>	Yes	The recommendations do quite a good job of identifying the target group for action, and are in general realistic (see for instance bullet 3 under the subhead "CIDA" in section 7.2, where CIDA's budgetary constraints are taken into consideration). No information is provided on the process followed to develop the recommendations.	
<p>47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes</p>	Mostly		
<p>48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.</p>	No		
Appropriate lessons learned			
<p>49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.</p>	Yes	Lessons learned are correctly identified and broken down according to 'operational' and 'developmental' lessons. Not all of the lessons are generalizable (see section 7.1).	
<p>50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.</p>	Mostly		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negative), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Recommendations and lessons learned are quite strong, though recommendations could be more detailed and lessons more generalizable.</p>		

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Style and presentation			F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Yes	The report is well structured and logically presented. The appendices included important elements, such as the evaluation plan and results framework, but they were lacking the ToR.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes			
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Mostly			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Mostly			
Executive Summary			Unsatisfactory	
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	No	This evaluation report did not include an Executive Summary.		
56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	No			
57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	No			
58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	No			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negative), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The style and presentation are generally good although the report should have included an Executive Summary and the ToR for the evaluation.			
Additional Information				
Question		Remarks		

<p>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the ToR are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate ToR. This should be noted under vii in the next section</p>	The report does not include the ToR; these should be included in the future.		
(e.g. local ownership, joint responsibility for results, community involvement and gender equity).	The evaluation addresses all key evaluation criteria and additional criteria that are specifically relevant to this programme.		
<p>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</p>	The evaluation demonstrates very good knowledge of the Bolivian socio-political context as well as the CIDA political reality in which the programme was implemented.		
OVERALL RATING			
<p>Question</p>	<p>cc</p>	<p>Remarks</p>	<p>OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.</p>
<p>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>This evaluation is useful for CIDA or other bilateral donors interested in taking a sector-wide approach to its funding. There is little information that UNICEF could use to further its own knowledge of what worked, for whom, in what conditions and why.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>The report was commissioned by CIDA for a CIDA-funded programme. It is a fairly good report in that it provides a good summary of the context, clear information on each of the evaluation criteria and is well organised. There could have been more rigour in the analysis of results, particularly given the multi-stakeholder design in this programme. There was ample space for a contribution analysis but this opportunity was missed. Further, there was very little information provided as to UNICEF's interventions, modalities and successes/failures as they related to the overall programme. Given that this review was carried out from a UNICEF perspective and very little information is provided to aid in UNICEF's learning process, a low rating was given.</p>
<p>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>The sections hold together in a logical way with common threads throughout; however, it is quite discursive.</p>	
<p>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</p>	<p>ToR</p>	<p>ToR not provided.</p>	
<p>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negative), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The overall rating reflects the fact that the report was commissioned by CIDA and for a CIDA-funded programme of which UNICEF was one of many actors. The lack of contribution analysis makes it difficult for UNICEF to draw any particular lessons pertaining to its interventions and the role that they had in contributing to the results achieved.</p>		