

EVALUATION ID

2550-2012/010

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	MULTI-SECTOR EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO IVORIAN REFUGEES AND HOST COMMUNITIES IN FOUR LIBERIAN COUNTIES OF NIMBA, GRAND GEDEH, RIVERGEE & MARYLAND
Report sequence number	2012/010
Date of Review	24/01/2013
Year of the Evaluation Report	2012
Region	West and Central Africa Regional Office
Country	Liberia
Type of Report	Evaluation
TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer	Universalia
Classification of Evaluation Report	
	Comments
Geographical (<i>Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings</i>)	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.
Purpose (<i>Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être</i>)	3.5 Humanitarian: Humanitarian evaluation assesses organizational performance in emergency settings (including both natural disasters & conflicts) at various phases of these crises, from preparedness and risk reduction to response, recovery & the transition to development
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>)	5.2 Multi-sectoral: Addresses issues in two or more MTSP focus areas
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.
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.	Mostly	The object of the evaluation is described briefly at the beginning of the evaluation as an emergency program to address critical needs in 4 sectors (p.5) in 4 specific geographic locations later mentioned (p.7). At the beginning, a very brief context paragraph describes the events which caused the need for this intervention (p.5), but no information is given on a results framework, logic model or theory of change for these interventions. Basic information on the target population is not provided and the context of Sierra Leonean refugees living among host communities in Liberia is not clear.	<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.</p> <p>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>
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	No		
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.	No		
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.	No	A narrative summary of targeted results and broad activities are listed in the evaluation report. 4 key result areas are identified and very broad activity categories are listed (p.5-6). A table of outputs is included as Annex 5 but it is not possible to interpret the data presented accurately as there are no baselines. Further, the link between UNICEF's activities and the "achieved outputs/activities" listed is unclear.	<p style="text-align: center;">Unsatisfactory</p>
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	No	The key partners with whom UNICEF implemented the programme are listed and linked to the specific sector in which they were involved (p.6). But their exact role and functions are not described. Stakeholders are not identified from an equity perspective; no information is	
Stakeholders and their contributions			
			<p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
			<p>The importance of programme theory to guide the intervention should be discussed and its absence critiqued. Clarity on the range of stakeholders and a description of their rights would strengthen the framework within which the evaluation is carried out and the findings presented.</p>

<p>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</p>	No	<p>provided on either rights holders or duty bearers, nor are the most vulnerable within the target population (either the refugees or the host community) identified. Further, although the evaluation is meant to look only at the ECHO supported programme, this was part of a multi donor programme and the contributions of other collaborating partners are not identified.</p>		
<p>7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</p>	Mostly	<p>The broad financial contributions from UNICEF and ECHO are listed in the Executive Summary (p.1). There are few examples of UNICEF's role explained. It took a key coordination and monitoring role while supporting county authorities to lead the processes (p.1, 24). It also procured testing/treatment supplies, educational supplies and other NFI for the CHT to distribute (p.16, 17).</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>	Mostly	<p>It is clearly stated that this project ended after one year of implementation (July 2011 to June 2012). The evaluation took place between August and October 2012. There is no information related to any changes in the implementation process that occurred when the activities were being implemented.</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>This project would have benefited from a clear programme theory and results framework identifying UNICEF's inputs and expected results alongside those of other partners. There should also have been a more detailed stakeholder analysis carried out from an equity perspective prior to initiating the project.</p>			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Purpose, objectives and scope			
<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>The purpose of this evaluation is stated fairly clearly at the beginning of the report; there is a broad statement of the intended users of the information and some of the intended uses of the evaluation information (p.6). Given that this is a humanitarian intervention, more detailed information could have been made to this specific context as it relates to the evaluation criteria specific to humanitarian contexts (coverage, coherence and connectedness).</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>	Mostly	<p>The objectives of the evaluation are described through the key questions it seeks to address (p.6-7), however, these questions are more limited than what was included in the TORs. The scope of the evaluation is fairly well defined and aligns with the scope identified in the TORs (p.7, 46). More clarity on the host and refugee community populations would have been beneficial.</p>	
<p>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)</p>	Yes	<p>The purpose and the scope are related but a richer analysis of this complex setting could have been provided.</p>	
Evaluation framework			
<p>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></p>	Mostly	<p>The criteria identified are aligned with the OECD/DAC and include all those requested in the TORs (p.6-7, 47) but the rationale for accepting them all was not provided. The criteria on efficiency was added to the evaluation framework without having been included with specific questions in the TORs, which is not problematic but was not explained. Further, the inclusion of criteria related to the humanitarian context could have been highlighted and its relevance explained. No explanation was provided for the selection of only certain questions from the TORs.</p>	<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p> <p>The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clear and link together but considerably more information on the selection of objectives and evaluation questions could have been provided. The proposed evaluation questions in the TOR were more thoughtful and considered than what ended up being used in the evaluation.</p>
			<p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p> <p>A more detailed explanation of the evaluation criteria deemed relevant and the evaluation questions chosen would have strengthened the analysis and findings.</p>

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 (positives & negatives), & justify rating.
Up to two sentences

Increased clarity on the use and users of the evaluation findings might have brought increased clarity to the evaluation and report.

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

Question	cc	Remarks		
Data collection				<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 evaluation was conducted using a mix of data collection methods including literature review, interviews with key informants, focused group discussions and a household survey (p.7). However, no rationale was provided for the methods chosen, their strengths and limitations, or any analytical challenges posed by the broader context.</p> <p>Reference is made to the sampling method in the report, but it is not clearly defined. This is a fairly important weakness given that the refugee community seems to have been both living in camps and in host communities. The sampling techniques appeared clear and simple in the report but the context would seem to have been more complex than was alluded to by the evaluators (p.8).</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>	No	<p>The report briefly mentions the fact that it triangulated the data for the analysis (p.10), but does not go into sufficient detail on this point - particularly regarding internal validity issues. No reference is made to benchmarks, which would have been warranted given the international standards that exist on humanitarian response and coordination. Some mention is made of data limits - for instance, the lack of donor disaggregated data (p.10) - but the absence of programme theory is not highlighted.</p>		
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>	No	<p>No ethical considerations are described, which is a significant weakness of the report given the use of focus group discussions with children and young people. The absence of an analysis of whose voices were heard in this evaluation and whose were not would have added a level of</p>		

<p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</p> <p>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	rigour to the report.		
Results Based Management				
<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>	No	<p>The evaluation mentions the lack of donor disaggregation of data on outputs, and the lack of baseline to compare the monitored results to. (p.10)</p> <p>Gaps were noted in monitoring information and consolidation of activities of all partners involved. For instance, overall outputs were not readily captured in an organised manner to provide information when required (p.24). But the evaluation doesn't give more details on the functioning or the tools used or of the lack of M&E framework for the project. On many occasions in the findings, it highlights lack of monitoring of specific information that should be sought to improve performance, and those are addressed in the recommendations (p.13, 24, 29-30).</p> <p>The evaluation uses UNICEF sector monitoring reports (see footnote Annex 5, p.51) and refers to triangulating them with the data collected through other means (namely interviews, focus group discussions and the survey), to inform the findings, however more information on the triangulation process (what findings were reinforced by different data sources) could have been provided.</p>	Mostly Satisfactory	<p>Inclusion of the evaluation plan and justification of the methods used would have strengthened this report. It would have been beneficial to take ethical issues more directly into consideration and to create a logic model in the absence of one from the client. Involving stakeholders in the evaluation process beyond data collection is best practice and is encouraged. For example, in the context of this evaluation, key stakeholders (not just UNICEF) could have been consulted to validate the findings and recommendations.</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>	Mostly			

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 mapped its findings against the CCC standards and provided some comments in this regard (p. 24-26), but it is not clear if there the project was designed with these targets in mind given the absence of a results or M&E framework.

The are a few references made using human rights language in the report, but there is a general absence of a human rights approach in this evaluation. Duty bearers and rights holders are not clearly identified nor is there any delineation within either the host or refugee communities as to the most vulnerable and/or how the targeting in the programmes occurred. The evaluation reports that the programme was implemented using the principles of humanity, impartiality and neutrality but little evidence is provided to substantiate this claim. The only references that were made that could be seen to be from an equity approach related to the provision of services to both refugees and host communities but these are very broad categories within which there is considerable heterogeneity that should have been explained and analysed.

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

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.

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.

No

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.

No

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>	No	<p>There is a lack of evidence of stakeholder participation in the evaluation. There seems to have been a validation workshop (see Annex 6, p.54) with UNICEF staff, but the when and why are not explained and there was limited additional identification of other 'use' and 'users'.</p>
<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	<p>There is no apparent effort to construct a counterfactual. The methodology seems to link back to the purpose of the evaluation but clearer justification for the methods chosen is warranted. The results from the interviews and focus group discussions were apparently triangulated with the household survey results, the analysis of documents and results monitored (p.10) but little evidence is provided to substantiate this claim.</p>
<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>	Yes	<p>Some data sources limitations are identified, i.e. UNICEF's data not being disaggregated by donor (thus not specific to ECHO as the scope required) and the lack of baseline to make comparisons (p.10).</p>
<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>The accessibility issue due to weather constraints is also identified as a challenge and hindered the ability to maintain a random sample, but the report states that it did not affect the quality of the data (p.10). However, overall methodological limitations are not addressed and the data collection tools are not detailed (other than the household survey provided in Annex 1, p.31-39). The issue of bias was not addressed in the report.</p>

Executive Feedback on Section C

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

Overall the methodological approach to this evaluation is clear but there is considerable room for improvement in the following areas: use of an equity framework in all stages of the evaluation, recognition of the strengths and limitations of certain methods, clearer and broader definition of use and users, deeper analysis of bias and a conscious effort to address ethical concerns, particularly as children and youth are involved in certain data collection processes.

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings			<p>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>Findings seem to make objective use of the evidence collected to answer the evaluation questions.</p> <p>Outputs are described in the context of CCC standards, in some cases, but there is generally very little reference made to results-based planning or management in this evaluation.</p> <p>All criteria mentioned in the evaluation's objectives are addressed for the 4 sectors and only a few questions are not addressed (or only partially addressed).</p> <p>But the overall clarity of the reporting structure could have been improved.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	Mostly	<p>Some limitations in the data are identified, i.e. UNICEF's data not being disaggregated by donor (thus not specific to ECHO as the scope required) and the lack of baseline to make comparisons.</p> <p>There is an effort made to mitigate these in the evaluation and caveats are included on how to interpret the data (p.10). For instance, outputs are attributed to ECHO based on its contribution (see footnote annex 5, p.51). However, there could have been more references made to the lack of a results-based framework, absence of baselines or agency-specific targets and the limitations that result from this.</p> <p>There are no unusual findings mentioned.</p>	<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p>	<p>Key findings were far too descriptive and detailed. Conclusions should be stated clearly and accessibly, adding value and understanding, to inform various potential users of the evaluation.</p>
<p>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.</p>	No	<p>Some limitations in the data are identified, i.e. UNICEF's data not being disaggregated by donor (thus not specific to ECHO as the scope required) and the lack of baseline to make comparisons.</p> <p>There is an effort made to mitigate these in the evaluation and caveats are included on how to interpret the data (p.10). For instance, outputs are attributed to ECHO based on its contribution (see footnote annex 5, p.51). However, there could have been more references made to the lack of a results-based framework, absence of baselines or agency-specific targets and the limitations that result from this.</p> <p>There are no unusual findings mentioned.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>There are no unusual findings mentioned.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	N/A	<p>There are no unusual findings mentioned.</p>		
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

There is a brief cost analysis looking at the cost of the programme per beneficiary (taking into account the inter-sector linkages since it's a multi-sector programme). A judgement call on the efficiency is made taking into account the context in which the programme was implemented, but there is no comparison made with other programmes in similar contexts (p.23-24). In addition, issues surrounding the funding are highlighted.

There is no cost analysis of scaling up which could have been of value if there are additional counties with refugees in Liberia, but this information is not provided.

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>	No	Although the contribution of UNICEF is highlighted on several occasions and outputs are linked to ECHO based on its financial contribution as much as possible, the evaluation doesn't present information from or attribute results to other partners.
<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>	No	The period was deemed too short to demonstrate causality. However, the evaluation report neglects to highlight the absence of a results-based framework without which it is virtually impossible to draw conclusions about causality.
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	Constraints are identified for the 4 sectors and their implications are detailed. For example, findings regarding Protection included the lack of funding and time (i.e. PCAs too short) hindering the capacity to manage cases of unaccompanied and separated children, lack of reporting of abuse cases for different reason, etc. (p.22-23).
<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>	No	In the conclusions section of the report, the programme achievements and its strengths are highlighted, mentioning that there were challenges and shortcomings but not giving details (p.27).
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>	No	The conclusions are very brief, simplistic statements reaffirming some aspects of the detailed findings without adding value. There is no attention given to various potential users in the presentation of the conclusions.
<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).

No

Executive Feedback on Section D
Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.
Up to two sentences

The findings were based on evidence and responded to the evaluation criteria, but the conclusions were poorly formulated. In the absence of a programme theory or results-based framework, it is challenging to make robust and useful findings and conclusions.

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	The recommendations are organised by sector rather than by evaluation criteria. They do appear fairly relevant to the object of the evaluation and they clearly reflect the stated findings and observations. However, not all the findings are reflected in the recommendations and there were significant analytical gaps in the report. For example in education, the feedback from the parents about the lack of food in schools or the finding on the lack of teachers are not addressed in the recommendations (p.19-20). They are clearly stated, but not prioritised.	<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>
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Mostly		
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		
Usefulness of recommendations			
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.	Yes	<p>Recommendations are linked to identified users, all of whom are institutional (UN, govt, partners) and organised by sector. Some include specific suggestions on how those could be achieved, but not all (p.29-30).</p> <p>The lack of description of the object of the evaluation and the context in which it's taking place makes it hard to assess how realistic the recommendations are.</p> <p>Although the report mentions having taken into considerations the views of the stakeholders collected in the formulation of the recommendation, there is no clear evidence of participation, except for two quotes related to awareness raising on issues of violence, abuse GBV, etc. (p.30).</p>	<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p> <p>The recommendations relate to the findings reported in the analysis and are linked to the target groups concerned. Some also include suggestions on how to take action. However, they are not prioritised. They seem to be realistic, but the lack of contextual information hinders the assessment. Lessons learned are very weak.</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	No		
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.	No	Lessons learned are brief, repetitive and lacking substance. They do not contribute to general knowledge and repeat already known 'good practice' that should be applied in humanitarian response. Further, clear reference should have been made to the context within which this	<p>More effort could be made to include suggestions on how to implement the recommendations.</p> <p>Stakeholders participation in the formulation or validation of the recommendations would have enhanced the usefulness and ownership.</p>

Constructive feedback for future reports
Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

<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>	<p>No</p>	<p>been made to the context within which this intervention was being carried out, the target populations and sub-populations and the absence of programme theory and M&E framework as major limitations and/or lessons learned for UNICEF Liberia.</p>		
<p>Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Recommendations appear relevant but are limited. The evaluators could have more clearly included various stakeholders in the formulation of those recommendations. Lessons learned were not adequately developed.</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	Mostly	The opening pages include the name of the evaluated object, the evaluation period, the location, the name of the evaluator, name of the organization commissioning the evaluation, a full table of content and a list of acronyms. The report is logically structured.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes	The annexes include the TORs, a list of person met and key informants, a list of documents, the household questionnaire, and a table of outputs (p.iv, 31-54). These are useful and increase the credibility of the report. However, some other relevant documents could have been added to the annexes, such as interview protocols, the evaluation matrix, etc. to increase the usefulness.		
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?	Yes			
Executive Summary			Mostly Satisfactory	
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	All of the main information from the report is contained in the executive summary with important findings highlighted and the key recommendations and lessons learned listed. It is thorough enough to stand alone (p.1-4). See comments in earlier sections on the quality of the analysis.		
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	Yes			
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	Yes			
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.	Yes			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The report is structured in a coherent way. Annexes could have included other useful documents.			
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 TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section</p>	<p>The evaluation addresses most of what is contained in the TORs with the exception of some thoughtful evaluation questions that were not included in the evaluation.</p>
<p>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation</p>	<p>The structure of the report was adequate and the data collection methods used seemed appropriate even though they were lacking a justification for their choice.</p>
<p>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise</p>	<p>Reference was made to the CCCs, but this could have been integrated more fully into the evaluation plan.</p>

OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Q/ 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 methodology used seemed appropriate but lacked context and justification. The evidence was not particularly robust given that it was not anchored in a results framework with clear project-specific baselines or targets. The analysis is somewhat shallow, as are the findings and recommendations.	Unsatisfactory This evaluation report lacked some very basic elements - an evaluation plan, theory of change for the intervention, justification for the data collection methods used and their limitations, analysis from an equity perspective, identification of a broad range of uses and users and reference to 'good practice' in humanitarian response as a benchmark.
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'.	Mostly	The whole report is fairly logically structured and holds together.	
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	The TORs were not followed in their entirety. There were questions included in the TORs that were not picked up by the evaluator - namely, on impact and relevance.	
	Other	The lack of programme theory or logic model for the intervention was a serious gap that should have been addressed clearly by the evaluator.	
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	This report was overly descriptive and cannot be used with confidence.		