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 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	**Equity- Focused Formative Evaluation of UNICEF's Engagement in the Decentralization Process in Indonesia**	

Report sequence number	2014/004	**Date of Review**	20/05/15	**Year of the Evaluation Report**	2014
Region	East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office			**Country**	Indonesia
Type of Report	Evaluation			**TORs Present**	Yes
Name of reviewer	**Universalia Management Group**				

Classification of Evaluation Report		Comments
Geographic Scope (*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 (*Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions*)	2.3 Joint managed, with organisations outside the UN system: UNICEF is the co-manager with one or more organizations outside the UN system	
Purpose (*Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être*)	3.3 Policy: An evaluation whose main purpose is to examine the results of a policy that is delinked from field-based programming operations.	
Result (*Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached*)	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	"The evaluation framework for the project included both process and outcome evaluation features." (p. 21.)
SPOA Correspondence (*Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities: (1) Health; (2) HIV-AIDS; (3) WASH; (4) Nutrition; (5) Education; (6) Child Protection; (7) Social Inclusion; (8) Cross-Cutting - Gender Equality; and (9) Cross-cutting - Humanitarian Action*)	5.10 Touches more than one outcome. Please specify in the comments.	Decentralization support.
Level of Independence (*Implementation and control of the evaluation activities*)	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.	
Approach	7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme	

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

Question	cc	Remarks	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Object and context			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.	
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	The object of the evaluation is described in section 2.0 (p. 16.) It does not provide detail about the specific activities but is supported by a logical framework (developed by the evaluation team for the evaluation) (p. 18). The context is well described in terms of decentralization as a concept (1.1 p. 12,) decentralization within the Indonesian context and also decentralization and its impact on Child Rights (Section 1.3, p. 13). The context is sufficient to illuminate the findings.		
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	Outstanding			
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.	Yes			
Theory of Change			The report presents a clear and full description of the evaluated object. In fact the evaluators have done an excellent job in mitigating the absence of a Theory of Change by developing a Logical Framework for the purpose of guiding the evaluation and also for use by UNICEF Indonesia after the evaluation. The context is outstandingly described by the evaluators. It covers decentralisation as a concept, decentralisation in Indonesia and the impact of decentralisation on Child Rights. Stakeholders are clearly identified, but the implementation status is not as clearly articulated.	The manner in which the evaluators frame the context of decentralization by discussing it as a conceptual term, its role in Indonesia and its impact on Child Rights is outstanding and helps educate non-expert readers. When evaluators react to a lack of Theory of Change or Logical Framework by developing one (as was the case here) this is a best-practice that should be noted. Further, the Logical Framework seems to be developed beyond the needs of the evaluation and is a resource that the program can build upon in creating a monitoring system.
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.	Outstanding	The evaluators note that "The UNICEF decentralization programme has not developed a Logical Framework (LF) or Theory of Change model." The evaluators developed their own Logical Framework for the evaluation which also describes the theory of change (p. 18). The outstanding rating reflect the quality of the logical framework and the clarity that it imposes on the evaluation.		
Object and context				
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	Yes	Stakeholders are clearly and explicitly identified in section 2.1 (p. 16.) Program beneficiaries are described in the same section.	Highly satisfactory	
6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Mostly	The contributions of stakeholders are described on page 16. The report provides only limited details in this regard.		
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Mostly	UNICEF Indonesia's Country Program budget is provided (p. 17.) It is not broken down to illustrate the budget expended on supporting decentralization. The evaluation is self described as a 'Contribution Analysis' (p. 22).		
Implementation Status				

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	Mostly	The object is described as an ongoing effort rather than a project with a start and an end. Decentralisation in Indonesia is described as ongoing since the 1970s (p. 16.) It is not clear how long UNICEF has been actively engaged in supporting decentralization. The timing of the evaluation is described in relation to the development of the 2016-2020 UNICEF Country Programme (p. 14.)			
Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The object is clearly described. It is supported by a robust Logical Framework which was developed by the evaluators in the absence of an existing Logical Framework or Theory of Change. The context is also clearly described. Stakeholders are explicitly identified.**				

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 presented in the body of the report as its 'Focus' (p. 14.) It describes the timing of the evaluation in relation to the development of UNICEF Indonesia's 2016-2020 Country Programme, (p. 14) which also explains how the information is being used and by whom. It is also expressed in the attached TOR (p. 73) that the results from this formative evaluation will be "applied to current programming (pre-2016), especially for the design or adjustment of activities and work plans at decentralized levels."	**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** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	Mostly	The objectives of the evaluation are expressed as 'Key Questions' (p. 14). These are supported by three evaluation 'results' (p. 14). They are clear, tangible and realistic. Scope is not addressed explicitly in the body of the report (although it is in the TOR p. 74). This accounts for the mostly satisfactory rating.		
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	The objectives and scope relate to the objectives and 'focus' of the evaluation.		
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. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Mostly	The evaluation provides a relevant list of evaluation criteria "The evaluation covers programme relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and equity, as well as the impact on children from UNICEF's engagement in the decentralization process." (p. 12) The 'mostly satisfactory' rating reflect the fact that the criteria were not explicitly described as such. In general the body of the report does not provide a well structured introduction to the evaluation framework. The criteria are not justified - as is most often the case when standard OECD/DAC criteria are employed.	**Mostly Satisfactory** The evaluation's objectives are sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation. However, the evaluators do not employ the standard evaluation vocabulary in structuring the foundation (purpose, objectives, scope and criteria) for the evaluation. In general, the information is present but not labeled in the standard fashion.	In the interest of maximizing clarity the evaluators may consider explicitly describing 'scope.' In the findings section the evaluators are very clear about their approach to each evaluation criteria. This information could be replicated in a stand-alone section within the methodology. In general, with consideration to UNICEF's mode of decentralized evaluations and ratings system the evaluators should employ a more typical approach to describing the purpose, objectives and scope.
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 non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or 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 (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	Overall the report provides a clear and tangible explanation of its intent and objectives. However, the approach is not typical in terms of its vocabulary, structure, etc. For example it does not explicitly address purpose or scope. The same is true of the evaluation criteria which are addressed almost in passing and not labeled as 'criteria' or 'evaluation framework.'

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY				
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**		
Data collection				
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.	Outstanding	Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 describe data collection methods (Document review, Key informant interviews and online survey respectively) (p. 23). The report specifies as the approach to data collection - "historical/ retrospective approach [which] relies on the memory of people who participated or were affected by UNICEF's engagement in the decentralization process." (p. 22) The report also outlines a specific method of analysis - "Contribution analysis was used to assess causal questions and make conclusions about the contribution of UNICEF to particular outcomes." (p. 22) An outstanding rating was awarded here because it is not typical for an evaluation to describe its particular approach to analysis. The specific data sources and the rationale for their selection is explained in section 4.0 (p. 23) and also in the appendices (p. 111).	**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. 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.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	Yes			
Ethics				
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	Yes	An ethical statement (p. 7) describes how the evaluation adapted ethical considerations into its approach. The ethical statement (referenced above) notes that the confidentiality of respondents was safeguarded. Also that the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation are impartial.		
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	Yes			
Results Based Management				
18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? 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.	Yes	The evaluators assessed the capability and robustness of the objects monitoring system. Their main finding was that no Logical Framework or Theory of Change existed (p. 17).	Overall the report presents a tangible and transparent description of the methodology which clearly explains how the evaluation was designed to address the evaluation criteria and in this case 'key questions.' The limitations of the methodology are not acknowledged. Gender analysis is apparent in the findings but the approach is not described in the methodology section.	The development of a Logical Framework by the evaluators (where none was provided by the Country Programme) strengthens the evaluation considerably and can also be used by the programme moving forward to develop a monitoring system. The report should address limitations of the research methodology. Gender appears as a heading in the findings section but is barely mentioned in the opening pages or methodology. The evaluators should describe their approach
19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? 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.	Outstanding	Finding that no Logic Model existed the evaluators developed a robust Logical Framework which the program can use to build its monitoring system. This is reflected in the outstanding rating.		

to analysing gender.

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. Promote gender-sensitive interventions as a core programmatic priority, To the extent possible, all relevant policies, programmes and activities will mainstream gender equality.	Yes	The evaluation assessed the extent to which the project contributes to outcomes through a human rights based framework. The evaluation design and style incorporates equity within the core evaluation criteria (p. 12). Its prominence in the evaluation approach is also evidenced by its inclusion in the evaluation project's title. Although gender is not mentioned in the evaluation design section it does appear as an independent section within the findings (Section 5.3 p. 58).	Highly satisfactory
21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. 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	The evaluation framework notes the inclusion of equity as an evaluation criteria (p. 12). Children are also a focus of the evaluation as expressed in the coverage of the evaluation - "The evaluation covers programme relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and equity, as well as the impact on children from UNICEF's engagement in the decentralization process." (p. 12)	
22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. 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. Support for humanitarian action – achieving faster scaling up of response, early identification of priorities and strategies, rapid deployment of qualified staff and clear accountabilities and responses consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of unrest or armed conflict.	Mostly	Gender is included as its own section in the findings (Section 5.3 p. 58). Gender also appears in the Lesson Learned (p. 70). Information on Gender is not found in the description of the methodology. In the opening pages it is mentioned as an evaluation criteria (p. 12). As described above, equity is a core criteria of the evaluation framework (p. 12, 14) and its inclusion cascades through the findings (p. 28, 29, 31, 38, 40 etc.) conclusions (p. 64, 65,) recommendations (p. 69,) and lessons learned (p. 70).	
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.

Yes

Stakeholder participation				
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.	No	The nature of stakeholders consultation with regard to designing and implementing the evaluation is not known.		
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.	No			
Methodological robustness				
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.	Yes	The report utilizes contribution analysis to address issues of contribution / causality- "Contribution analysis was used to assess causal questions and make conclusions about the contribution of UNICEF to particular outcomes." (p. 22.)		
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.	Yes	The evaluation methodology facilitates answers to the evaluation questions. This is supported by the Logical Framework (p. 18) which links data collection methods with the narrative summary of the program's outputs and outcomes. It is also supported by the Evaluation Matrix which connects data sources and collection methods with specific evaluation questions (Appendix 3, p. 88.)		
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	No	The report does not specifically recognize limitations of the methodology.		
Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The methodology is clear and transparent. It is also robust and capable of addressing the evaluation criteria and key questions. The Logical Framework developed specifically for the evaluation is a notable achievement. Although Gender analysis is apparent in the findings the approach is not described in this section.			

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?	Constructive feedback for future reports
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.	Yes	The evaluators do a commendable job of connecting findings with evidence. For example, in the findings section on relevance (5.2.1 p. 27) the evaluators use footnotes to connect findings to evidence from the literature review which is included in the appendices (Appendix 2, p. 78). In the findings section related to 'Effectiveness' the report connects specific findings with results from the survey or key informant interviews (p. 42, 43, 44 etc).	**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.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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.	Yes	The findings systematically address the evaluation criteria and key questions. This is supported by the evaluation matrix attached in the appendices (p. 88). Findings demonstrate the progression of results based on evidence reported. The report does not identify gaps and limitations in addressing evaluation questions based on data collected. The report does not name findings as 'unexpected' but the approach to data collection and analysis appears open to information which isn't expected.		
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		The findings and conclusions are clearly presented and based in evidence. The evaluators demonstrate sound analysis which renders valuable insights. The strong foundation laid by the Evaluation Matrix and Logical Framework support a well organized and systematic presentation of findings. However, the evaluators do not explicitly identify gaps and limitations in their data.	The evaluators should specify gaps and limitations in the data. Although they may have been satisfied with the data collection process it is always possible to identify areas where there are limitations. This increases confidence in the findings. In the findings section related to the evaluation criteria the evaluators include quoted guidance on approaching the OECD/DAC criteria. This is helpful to the reader as it explains how the analysis is being conducted. It is an excellent practice which should be carried through to future reports.
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.	No			
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.	Mostly			
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: 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	As one of the 'Key Questions' of the evaluation the report asks "How cost effective has UNICEF's engagement in the decentralization process been as a means to promote equitable realization of child rights in Indonesia?" (p. 8). The investigation into this question was only qualitative, asking the question of respondents, and did not examine the program's financials (p. 54-55).		

Contribution and causality			
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.	Yes	Assigning contribution for results to stakeholders is achieved through the type of question asked to stakeholders. For example - "To what extent has UNICEF established meaningful partnerships/ mechanisms with other key actors at sub- national level to avoid duplication of effort or miscommunication?"(p. 53) In this example we see that stakeholders are being asked to connect results with actions. i.e. the result 'avoiding duplication of effort' is being connected with the action 'establishing meaningful partnerships/mechanisms.' This also illustrates causal reasons for accomplishments and failures.	**Highly satisfactory**
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. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Yes		
Strengths, weaknesses and implications			
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.	Yes	Future implications and continuing constraints are thoroughly described in Appendix 10: Challenges and Opportunities of Decentralization for UNICEF (p. 132).	
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.	Yes	Conclusions present a balanced perspective on the evaluated object (p. 63-64). For example, within the conclusions on relevance "UNICEF does not adequately scan the decentralization scene/aid effectiveness arenas to anticipate risks and opportunities arising from changing government policies." (p. 63)	
Completeness and insight of conclusions			
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.	Yes	Conclusions are insightful and add value to the findings. They go beyond findings to identify underlying problems. Conclusions are drawn from findings which took into consideration the views of a broad spectrum of stakeholders.	
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.	Yes	The conclusions are written in plain language. They are insightful without being presented in an overly complex manner and are jargon-free.	
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).	Yes		

Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The conclusions add value to the report by summarizing the key findings and taking them further through insightful analysis. They appear balanced and objective. The findings are thorough and well organized. The report connects findings with evidence and demonstrates the progression from actions to results.

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?	Constructive feedback for future reports
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			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.	*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Outstanding	Recommendations are well grounded and based on the evidence and findings. Recommendations specify the findings they are based on. For example "Relevance: Findings #4 and #5." (p. 66). This is an outstanding practice.		
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes	Recommendations are relevant to the objectives and key questions of the evaluation.		
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.	Mostly	Recommendations are clearly stated but not prioritized. "The links between recommendations and relevant findings are highlighted in blue. They are not listed in priority order." (Footnote 62, p. 66).		
Usefulness of recommendations			Recommendations are relevant and expressed with clarity. They are realistic in the context of the evaluation. Linking recommendations to their source findings is an excellent practice.

Recommendations are targeted broadly at 'UNICEF'. They are not prioritized.

Lessons learned are correctly identified and are insightful. They are effectively generalized for wider relevance. | Explicitly linking recommendations with the findings they are based on is an excellent practice and should be continued.

Because of the large number of recommendations provided it would be beneficial to prioritize them. |
| **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. | Mostly | All recommendations are targeted at 'UNICEF'. The 'mostly satisfactory' rating reflects a lack of specificity with regard to the exact actors targeted.

Recommendations are realistic in the context of the evaluation.

The process of developing the recommendations is not described. In the Ethics Statement (p. 7) the report states that "The information, findings, recommendations and lessons learned enclosed in this report are independent and impartial:" which suggests that stakeholders were not involved in developing the recommendations. | | |
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	Yes		Highly satisfactory	
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.	Mostly			
Appropriate lessons learned				
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.	Yes	Lessons learned are correctly identified in section 8.0 (p. 70) and they are properly generalized for wider relevance.		
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.	Yes			

Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The recommendations are appropriate to the objectives of the evaluation and are insightful. The evaluators link each recommendation to its source in the findings which is a best-practice. Lessons learned are correctly identified, insightful and generalized for wider relevance.

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

Question	cc	Remarks	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 *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Style and presentation				
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 opening pages contain almost all of the basic elements such as the name of the evaluated object (Title page); date of the report (p. 2); Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators (p. 1); Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation (p. 1); Table of contents, and annex (p. 6); List of acronyms (p. 3-4). The report is logically structured and appropriately sequenced. An outstanding rating was awarded because of the way in which the evaluators structured the approach to analysing the findings as well as linking recommendations with findings. Throughout the report it was very easy to follow the evaluators process and see how evidence transitioned to findings, conclusions and recommendations. The appendices contain the appropriate elements. For example, ToRs (p. 71); List of interviewees (p. 111); List of documentary evidence (p. 96); Data collection instruments (p. 97); Copy of the evaluation matrix (p. 87). The appendices increase the credibility and usefulness of the report.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Outstanding		Overall the elements of the report are logically structured and correctly sequenced. The opening pages contain the appropriate information as do the appendices. The executive summary includes key findings, recommendations and lessons learned but does not describe the evaluated object or the research methodology.	For the executives summary to stand-alone for readers not intimately familiar with UNICEF Indonesia's decentralization interventions the report should describe the intervention and its activities. The evaluators should include a summarized description of the methodology in the executive summary.
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	Yes			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Yes		Highly satisfactory	
Executive Summary				
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	An executive summary is present.		
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	Mostly	The executive summary contains some but not all the necessary elements including: Overview of UNICEF Indonesia (p. 8) Key Questions (p. 8) Overview of findings (p. 8) Recommendations (p. 9) and Lessons Learned (p. 11). The executive summary does not fully describe the evaluated object. It describes the country office but not the 'object' which is really the subset of activities related to decentralization. Research Methodology is not present. The executive summary cannot fully stand alone due to the omission of key elements (as		

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	Mostly	alone due to the omission of key elements (as referenced above). The executive summary features key findings, recommendations and lessons learned. In that context it can inform decision making for those already familiar with the decentralization activities. Because of the lack of object description and research methodology the executive summary is not highly satisfactory in terms of supporting decision making.	
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.	Mostly		

Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The overall structure of the report was excellent. In particular the way the evaluators guide the reader through their analytical process in the findings section. The executive summary omitted key information such as describing the evaluated object and a methodology overview.**

Additional Information

Question	Remarks
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 TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	The evaluation successfully addresses the Terms of Reference.
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation	Linking recommendations with source findings. Developing robust Logical Framework.
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	

OVERALL RATING

Question	cc	Remarks	**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.

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?	Yes	The executive summary is insightful but incomplete. It does not describe the evaluated object or the research methodology. The opening pages take an unconventional approach to purpose, objectives, scope and evaluation criteria which is not incorrect but not fully compatible with this template. The findings section is clearly presented. As are the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. This is a highly professional report. Overall, the unconventional approach to setting the foundation of the evaluation is not serious enough to detract from the quality of the report.	A highly professional and credible evaluation. The evaluators approach to structuring and presenting the findings and recommendations is a best-practice. Also worth highlighting is the purpose built Logical Framework which was developed by the evaluators to overcome the absence of an articulated Theory of Change or Logical Framework. If there was an area for improvement to highlight it would be the somewhat unconventional approach to presenting the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation as well as introducing and justifying the evaluation criteria.
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'.	Yes	The reports sections come together in a logically consistent way. A noteworthy practice is linking the recommendations with the findings on which they are based.	**Highly satisfactory**
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.	ToRs		
	Other		
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**This is a professionally presented and well structured evaluation. The foundation was well served by a purpose built Logical Framework and an appropriate methodology. The findings, conclusions and recommendations are insightful. They are also presented with excellent clarity and it is easy for the reader to follow the results stream from evidence through to recommendations.**		