

EVALUATION ID	2760-2014/002
---------------	---------------

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	Évaluation du Programme WASH à l'école au Mali
Report sequence number	2014/002
Date of Review	20/05/2015
Year of the Evaluation Report	2014
Region	West and Central Africa Regional Office
Country	Mali
Type of Report	Evaluation
TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer	Universalia Management Group Limited
Classification of Evaluation Report	
Comments	
Geographic Scope (<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>)	3.7 Programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives
Result (<i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i>)	4.3 Impact: Final results of a programme or policy on the intended beneficiaries and, where possible, on comparison groups. Reflects the cumulative effect of donor supported programmes of cooperation and national policy initiatives.
SPOA Correspondence (<i>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</i>)	5.3 WASH: Supporting global efforts to eliminate open defecation and increase use of safe drinking water through improved and equitable access to safe drinking water sources, sanitation and healthy environments and improved hygiene practices. Programme areas: a) Water supply b) Sanitation c) Hygiene d) WASH in schools and early childhood developments centers e) WASH in humanitarian situations
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.
Approach	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Object and context				
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	Le chapitre B du rapport présente une brève présentation du contexte de l'intervention Dubaï-Cares, ainsi que de la situation de base en Eau, Hygiène et Assainissement en milieu scolaire au Mali. Le rapport s'appuie sur une enquête récente réalisée par le programme	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation? 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.	
2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Yes	Dubaï-Cares, qui permet de 'définir la situation de référence en eau, hygiène et assainissement dans près de 1 072 écoles réparties dans les régions de Bamako, Gao, Koulikoro, Mopti, Sikasso et Tombouctou' (p.8). De fait, la présentation du contexte permet de faire ressortir les progrès qui ont été réalisés par le programme Dubaï-Cares.		
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				
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	Le cadre logique du programme Dubaï-Cares est clairement présenté à la section C3 du rapport (p.18).	Highly satisfactory Le rapport d'évaluation présente l'objet d'évaluation de manière claire et structurée. Le chapitre B est entièrement consacré à cet effet. Il renseigne précisément sur l'objet et le contexte de l'évaluation, ainsi que le cadre logique du programme et les principaux acteurs. En revanche, le rapport n'indique pas si des changements majeurs sont apparus au cours de la mise en œuvre du programme.	
Stakeholders and their contributions				
5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Outstanding	Les principaux acteurs et parties prenantes du programme Dubaï-Cares sont décrits dans la section C2 du rapport (p.15). En complément, la figure 3 représente de manière schématique les relations institutionnelles entre les différents acteurs du programme (p.17). La section C2 renseigne également le lecteur sur les contributions de chaque acteur du programme, dont l'UNICEF.		
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	Yes			
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
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	Le rapport d'évaluation fournit des renseignements concernant les principales caractéristiques du programme sous forme de tableau (p.15). Cependant, le rapport ne contient pas d'informations concernant les changements qui se sont produits lors de la mise en œuvre du programme.		
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>	L'objet et le contexte de cette évaluation sont clairement présentés dans ce rapport. Un chapitre entier est dédié à cet effet et des figures et des tableaux-synthèse facilitent la compréhension du programme qui fait l'objet de l'évaluation.			

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

Le rapport devrait idéalement contenir une section détaillé sur les changements qui ont affecté de manière significative l'exécution du programme. Dans le cas où aucun changement majeur n'est survenu, un rapport d'évaluation devrait systématiquement l'indiquer.

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	La partie B2 du rapport de l'évaluation présente la raison d'être ainsi que le objectifs de cette évaluation (p.10). Les objectifs sont clairement énoncés et réalistes et se rattachent à la raison de conduire cette évaluation.		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.	
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Yes				
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes				
Evaluation framework					
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	No	Les évaluateurs ont suivi les questions d'évaluation, tels qu'énoncées dans les Termes de Référence. Ils proposent une matrice d'évaluation dans le chapitre F. Cependant, le rapport n'indique pas pourquoi les critères d'évaluation ont été retenus et ne mentionne à aucun moment les normes de l'OCDE/DAC.	Mostly Satisfactory	Le rapport présente clairement la raison de cette évaluation, ainsi que les objectifs attendus. Cependant, il n'y a aucune section qui traite du cadre de l'évaluation et qui justifie la sélection des critères d'évaluation.	Le chapitre portant sur la méthodologie de l'évaluation devrait systématiquement intégrer une section sur la sélection des critères d'évaluation. De plus, la matrice d'évaluation devrait être incluse dans le chapitre sur la méthodologie, et non dans un chapitre distinct à la suite des résultats de l'évaluation.
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. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	Le rapport aurait pu améliorer sa section sur le cadre de l'évaluation en intégrant une partie sur le choix des critères de l'évaluation. Le rapport pourrait également gagner en qualité en développant la nature et les objectifs de l'évaluation de manière plus approfondie.				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Data collection				
<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>	Yes	<p>La partie B.2 du rapport est entièrement consacrée à la méthodologie employée pour conduire cette évaluation (p.10). Cette partie présente les principales sources d'information ainsi que les outils utilisés pour obtenir des données. La méthode du 'Most-Significant Change' a été particulièrement utilisée dans le cadre de cette évaluation et fait l'objet d'une partie distincte (p.12).</p>	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	
<p>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>	Yes			
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>Le rapport ne présente aucune considération éthique, bien que les Termes de Référence suggéraient de le faire. Par conséquent, aucune mesure éthique n'est décrite dans le rapport.</p>		
<p>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	No			
Results Based Management				
<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>Le rapport fait référence aux systèmes de suivi et évaluation du programme faisant l'objet de l'évaluation (p.37).</p>		<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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</p>	Yes			
		<p>Le rapport présente une méthodologie claire et appropriée de manière générale. La principale méthode suivie est celle du 'Most Significant Change', ce qui démontre une certaine adéquation par rapport à l'objet évalué. Le rapport montre également une certaine rigueur pour employer des outils et des techniques permettent de répondre aux questions de l'évaluation et de minimiser les limites rencontrées lors de la collecte de données. En revanche, la méthodologie ne fait référence à aucune considération éthique</p>	<p>Un rapport d'évaluation devrait contenir une partie présentant les principales parties prenantes de l'évaluation et leur niveau de contribution. Un tableau pourrait être élaboré à cet effet pour présenter leur rôle et responsabilités dans le programme d'une part et leur niveau de contribution dans l'évaluation d'autre part.</p>	

Human Rights, Gender and Equity			
<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p>	No	<p>Le rapport ne présente aucune considération méthodologique aux dimensions des droits humains, du genre et de l'équité, bien que les Termes de Référence suggéraient de le faire. Toutefois, le rapport contient quelques résultats tenant compte de la dimension du genre à la page 34. (ex.. genre et latrines, genre et Club d'Hygiène, genre et acteurs externes de l'école).</p>	<p>ni à une approche intégrant les droits humains, le genre ou l'équité.</p>
<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p>	No		
<p>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)?</p> <p>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 accountability and response consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of</p>	No		
<p>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?</p> <p>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.</p>	Mostly		
<p>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</p> <p>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</p>	No	<p>Mostly Satisfactory</p>	

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>	<p>Mostly</p> <p>Une description des principales parties prenantes est fournie aux pages 15-16 du rapport. Cette description renseigne sur le rôle et les responsabilités de chacune des parties prenantes, et donc du type d'information recherché dans le cadre de l'évaluation. En revanche, le rapport n'indique pas le niveau de contribution des parties prenantes pour l'évaluation en soi.</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>	<p>No</p>
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>	<p>Yes</p> <p>La partie consacrée à la méthodologie de l'évaluation démontre une certaine rigueur. Les évaluateurs ont suivi la méthode du 'Most-Significant Change', ce qui démontre une certaine pertinence par rapport au profil des personnes interrogés et à la nature du programme faisant l'objet de l'évaluation (p.12). Par ailleurs, les limites de l'évaluation montrent une certaine acceptabilité et ont été minimisées par des approches spécifiques, telles que décrites par les évaluateurs (p.13).</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>	<p>Yes</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>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Cette section présente des éléments contrastés. D'un côté, la description des objectifs, des outils méthodologiques et des limites mettent en valeur la qualité de la méthodologie employée pour cette évaluation. En revanche, le rapport n'intègre aucune considération éthique ni aucune attention pour les dimensions de genre, de droits humains et d'équité, alors que les Termes de Référence invitaient à le faire.</p>

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings				
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Outstanding	Le chapitre du rapport consacré aux résultats est structuré en fonction des principaux critères d'évaluation et des questions s'y rattachant. Tous les résultats sont justifiés à l'aide d'information qui a été collectée à travers les différents outils méthodologiques. De fait, les résultats couvrent l'ensemble des questions de l'évaluation et démontrent une certaine progression dans la construction des conclusions de l'évaluation. Aucun constat inattendu n'est présenté.	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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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.	Outstanding			
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Yes			
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes			
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.	No			
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.	Yes	Une analyse des coûts est proposée à la page 50 et s'appuie sur des calculs réalisés par le programme faisant l'objet de l'évaluation. Un tableau de comparaison des coûts est proposé à la page 51, pour démontrer le souci de l'UNICEF de "vérifier les coûts et des les garder à un niveau raisonnable" (p.51).	Le rapport présente de manière claire les résultats et les conclusions de l'évaluation. Les résultats montrent que les évaluateurs ont utilisé des techniques variées et ont porté un souci à varier les sources d'informations afin de valider les données obtenues. Le rapport pourrait être bonifié toutefois en présentant de manière plus claire les forces et les faiblesses de l'objet évalué à considérer dans le futur.	Le tableau récapitulatif au chapitre F apporte une certaine valeur au rapport dans la mesure où il présente de manière succincte et structurée les résultats pour chacune des questions de l'évaluation.

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>	Yes	Les résultats de l'évaluation font clairement référence aux parties prenantes pour évoquer leur contribution à l'accomplissement du programme et aux résultats atteints.
<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>	Yes	
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>	Mostly	Le rapport contient des informations au sujet des forces, des faiblesses et des implications à considérer pour la suite du programme. Bien qu'il n'y ait pas de partie dédiée à cet effet, ces informations se trouvent à l'intérieur de chacun des résultats de l'évaluation.
<p>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Mostly	
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
<p>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Yes	Le rapport présente les conclusions de l'évaluation sous forme de tableau, au chapitre F (p.80). Il s'agit plus précisément des résultats de l'analyse pour chacune des questions d'évaluation. De fait, il propose une certaine logique utile et claire pour les utilisateurs de cette évaluation.
<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>	Yes	
<p>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).</p>	Yes	
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Le rapport présente de manière claire les résultats et les conclusions de l'évaluation. Les résultats montrent que les évaluateurs ont utilisé des techniques variées et ont porté un souci à varier les sources d'informations afin de valider les données obtenues. Le rapport pourrait être bonifié toutefois en présentant de manière plus claire les forces et les faiblesses de l'objet évalué à considérer dans le futur.</p>	

Highly satisfactory

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? 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.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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	Le rapport présente des recommandations de manière claire et structurée (p.77). Ces recommandations s'appuient sur les résultats de l'analyse et montrent une certaine pertinence par rapport à l'objet de l'évaluation et sont priorisées.		
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes			
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.	Yes			
Usefulness of recommendations			Mostly Satisfactory	Il est essentiel d'inclure une section à part entière sur les leçons apprises qui ressortent d'une évaluation. Par ailleurs, il serait bon de préciser explicitement à quel acteur/partie prenante, une recommandation s'adresse. Un tableau synthétique pourrait être une valeur ajoutée à cet égard.
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	Les recommandations élaborées dans ce rapport montrent une certaine utilité. Même si elles ne se réfèrent pas explicitement à la catégorie d'acteur visé en particulier, les recommandations sont réalistes et s'appuient sur les résultats de l'analyse de l'évaluation. Toutefois, le rapport ne précise pas comment ces recommandations ont été développées ni même si ces dernières ont été définies avec la contribution des parties prenantes.		
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			
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.	No			
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	Le rapport ne contient aucune leçon apprise.		
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.	No			
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>	Le rapport présente de manière claire et structurée une série de recommandations qui sont pertinentes pour le futur du programme évalué. En revanche, les recommandations n'indiquent pas comment elles ont été développées et pourraient être bonifiées en indiquant explicitement à quelle partie prenante, elles se réfèrent, en vue d'améliorer son utilisation.			

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?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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	La structure du rapport montre une certaine logique et clarté. La page couverture et les pages introductives contiennent toutes les informations importantes. Par ailleurs, les annexes apportent une valeur au rapport dans la mesure où elles fournissent des informations supplémentaires, qui enrichissent le contenu. Il est à noter toutefois l'absence d'une section sur les leçons apprises, ainsi que d'une liste de tableaux, de graphiques et des acronymes.	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.	
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes			
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Yes			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Yes			
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	Le rapport contient un résumé exécutif de 3 pages qui présentent toutes les informations requises de manière concise, claire et structurée (p.4-6).	Highly satisfactory	La structure et la longueur du résumé exécutif sont idéales pour avoir un aperçu de l'ensemble du rapport.
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	Outstanding			
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	Outstanding			
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.	Outstanding			
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>	Le rapport suit une structure claire et cohérente qui facilite la compréhension de l'évaluation. Toutes les informations requises sont présentes, à l'exception d'une section sur les leçons apprises, ainsi que d'une liste de tableaux, de graphiques et des acronymes.			
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	L'évaluation présentée dans ce rapport répond entièrement aux questions d'évaluation posée dans les Termes de Référence. Le tableau dans le chapitre F de ce rapport indique d'ailleurs les résultats principaux de l'analyse pour chacune des questions (p.80).			
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation	Lien entre les résultats de l'évaluation et chacune des questions d'évaluation sous forme d'un tableau synthétique (comme celui présenté dans le chapitre F p.80).			
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	Utilisation de la méthode 'Most-Significant Change'.			

OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	<p>OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?</p> <p>This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.</p>
<p>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?</p>	Yes	Le rapport présente des résultats de manière claire et logique. La méthodologie employée et les techniques associées montrent une certaine rigueur et un souci de varier les sources d'informations, tout en s'adaptant au contexte propre au programme à évaluer.	Highly satisfactory
<p>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.</p>	Yes	Le rapport d'évaluation s'appuie sur une structure claire et cohérente, suivant les principales questions d'évaluations.	
<p>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</p>	ToRs	N/A	
	Other	N/A	
<p>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></p>	<p>Ce rapport d'évaluation présente des résultats qui s'appuient sur des techniques et des méthodes rigoureuses et adaptées au contexte et à l'objet de l'évaluation.</p>		