### UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section &amp; Overall Rating</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Mostly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Mostly Satisfactory</th>
<th>High Quality</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Dark green</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title of the Evaluation Report**

End of Project Evaluation and Future Programming Entry-Points in the Field of Statistics and Evidence-Based Policy Making

|------------------------|----------|----------------|------------|-------------------------------|------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Central &amp; Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Moldova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of reviewer</th>
<th>Universalia Management Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Evaluation Report</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Scope</td>
<td>Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalisability of evaluation findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Evaluation</td>
<td>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Purpose of the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; (le si est d'être)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP Correspondence</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Independence</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Summative and formative: An evaluation that combines the elements of a formative and a summative evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards

- **UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System**
- **UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System**
- **UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards**

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the object of the evaluation well described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The object of the evaluation is well described in section 2.1 (Background), from the creation of the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in Moldova through the launch and evolution of the project (Strengthening the National Statistical System), including unresolved issues and weaknesses. This sets the stage well for the later analysis sections, without going into unnecessary detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The project's context (strategic goals, surrounding structures and frameworks) around the NBS is similarly brief but precise. This need to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, etc.) that have occurred - including the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does this illuminate findings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The early sections of the report are brief, but are filled with very useful and specific information. The project's context and evolution are well described, as are key stakeholders and their contributions (though the contributions and roles of the UN partners, notably UNICEF, are only very generally touched upon until much later in the report). The project's ToC is well outlined and explained, which helps reinforce the project background section and assists the reader in better understanding the project's objectives and inner workings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>The early sections of the report identify clear partnerships, roles, and contributions, and are supported by specific contributions of UNICEF and other partners. The ToC is well outlined and explained, which helps reinforce the project background section and assists the reader in better understanding the project's objectives and inner workings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

**Purpose, objectives and scope**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are all addressed in the same section (3.1). While purpose and scope are not explicitly labelled in the narrative, the objectives are provided in list format. Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover. Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The evaluation’s methodology section (3.1) presents the evaluation matrix in table format with associated criteria (standard OECD/DAC criteria), questions, indicators, and sources of data. However, the criteria evaluated are not presented or justified in the narrative (in relation to the purpose) until further in the report, under the findings section. The rationale for selecting the different criteria is provided at the start of each findings section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The report’s purpose, objectives and scope are logical and coherent. The report’s evaluation framework is presented briefly in the early sections, while justification for the selection of individual criteria in relation to the report’s purpose is provided later on in the narrative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are all addressed in the same section (3.1). While purpose and scope are not explicitly labelled in the narrative, the objectives are provided in list format. Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover. Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section B**

- **Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.**
- **The report’s purpose, objectives and scope are logical and coherent. The report’s evaluation framework is presented briefly in the early sections, while justification for the selection of individual criteria in relation to the report’s purpose is provided later on in the narrative.”**

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

- **Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section B**

- **Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.**
- **The report’s purpose, objectives and scope are logical and coherent. The report’s evaluation framework is presented briefly in the early sections, while justification for the selection of individual criteria in relation to the report’s purpose is provided later on in the narrative.”**
### SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy &amp; overcome data limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Are ethical issues and considerations described?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object’s monitoring system adequately assessed?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluated object’s monitoring system is addressed, for example in terms of the project’s ability to adapt to changing contexts and needs (pp. 33-34) and the use of data in monitoring progress and policy-making (pp. 32-33). The evaluation makes use of the project’s logframe to guide the assessment, notably by structuring the effectiveness section around key outcomes and the ability to monitor progress and improvements (pp. 35-36).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;E framework of the evaluated object?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?

The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes. The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not ‘good’ or ‘bad’, they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice.

Highly satisfactory

The report’s methodology is strong: sources and methods are varied and justified, evaluators make clear efforts to ensure that data is subjective and credible. Limitations are described in detail and adequate efforts are made to overcome them. Finally, stakeholder participation in the evaluation is explained and justified, which helps enhance the credibility of the overall report.

Ethical considerations related to the evaluation are addressed in a specific section, and human rights, gender and equity considerations are weaved throughout the report, from the methodology, to the

Outstanding

An excellent job was done in terms of developing a rigorous methodology (notably in terms of describing stakeholder participation in the evaluation process, as well as its purpose).
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 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-fulfilment of rights; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.

The evaluation indicates how the project helped stakeholders meet reporting requirements around a number of international treaties on human rights and gender (p. 32). Further, the way in which gender and human rights were integrated into the programme design (frameworks) is identified as a useful way to enhance the availability of disaggregated data to strengthen the capacity to respect human rights (p. 33).

Specific projects related to gender, human rights and equity/social exclusion (notably for measuring and monitoring the MDGs) are provided as examples of the ways in which the overall project contributed added value around these considerations (e.g. pp. 37-40). Capacity building through the project is also highlighted (e.g. p. 42). An additional section (5.6) is included on gender, human rights and equity considerations in relation with the project outcomes.

Gender is touched upon in many instances throughout the report, but a specific section on gender mainstreaming is included in the effectiveness section (pp. 40-42). Here, the evaluators assess the project's progress in terms of conducting gender-sensitive surveys and establishing gender-sensitive indicators. Gender considerations are also noted in 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.

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 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-fulfilment of rights; Gender considerations are also noted in 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.

Specific projects related to gender, human rights and equity/social exclusion (notably for measuring and monitoring the MDGs) are provided as examples of the ways in which the overall project contributed added value around these considerations (e.g. pp. 37-40). Capacity building through the project is also highlighted (e.g. p. 42). An additional section (5.6) is included on gender, human rights and equity considerations in relation with the project outcomes.

Gender is touched upon in many instances throughout the report, but a specific section on gender mainstreaming is included in the effectiveness section (pp. 40-42). Here, the evaluators assess the project’s progress in terms of conducting gender-sensitive surveys and establishing gender-sensitive indicators. Gender considerations are also noted in 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.
### Stakeholder participation

25. Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?
This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making. The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.

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.

### Methodological robustness

27. Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attributions?
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.

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.

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.

### Executive Feedback on Section C

The report’s methodology is strong, using varied sources and methods, as well as stakeholder participation to ensure quality control. Human rights, gender and equity are touched upon in many instances and are well integrated.

In the efficiency section, the evaluators note that it would be impossible to compare this project to others, as it is unique in its kind (p. 46).

The inclusion of the evaluation matrix within the report’s methodology section is a helpful way to illustrate how the reporting methodology supports answers to the evaluation questions.

The report's limitations are clearly described in a dedicated section (4). Each one is explained and justified, and the measures taken to overcome them are indicated, where appropriate.

Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?

| Stakeholder participation in the evaluation is described in both sections 3.1 and 3.2 (methodology) of the report, notably through the presentation of a list of deliverables and the importance these had as “checkpoints” for quality control with stakeholders. The evaluators go on to describe why stakeholder involvement was necessary to help enrich the evaluation, as well as ensure credibility and ownership of the findings and recommendations (pp. 24-25). They also indicate which stakeholders took part and provided feedback (p. 26). This seems sufficient for the task at hand. | Yes |

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. | Yes |

Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attributions?

| The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group. | Yes |

Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?

| The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions. | Yes |

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 | Yes |
SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question | cc | Remarks
--- | --- | ---
31 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? | Mostly | The analysis portion of the report is well-organised and systematic. Many examples are included. Key (findings) statements that summarise the overall assessment of each criterion are provided, but are perhaps insufficiently prominent (visually) in most cases (e.g. relevance, impact and sustainability). Using bolded statements as sub-headings to highlight key points, as was done in the effectiveness section, helps structure the paragraphs of analysis according to different project aspects. In addition, because the elements of most sections are divided into bullet-point lists of accomplishments, it is sometimes difficult to see progression to results. It may have been helpful to write a continuous narrative and include tables to demonstrate key accomplishments, in relation to desired outputs and outcomes.

32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? | Mostly | The main gap highlighted in relation to the project concerns the line ministries’ capacity to use statistics in policy development (p. 44, p. 96).

33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? | Mostly | No unexpected findings are discussed.

34 Are unexpected findings discussed? | No | The findings and conclusions are credible and relevant, largely thanks to the strong methodology on which they are based.

35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the evidence reported? | Yes | Cost analysis is conducted through a narrative (i.e. no specific costs or comparisons are provided). This choice is explained by evaluators, but perhaps some figures could have been provided to support statements such as: "The alternative delivery methods such as hiring permanent statistics experts placed in the NBS would be more costly..." (p. 46).

Cost Analysis

D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? | Highly satisfactory | The findings and conclusions are credible and relevant, largely thanks to the strong methodology on which they are based.

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

- It may be helpful to present examples of accomplishments in table format to shorten the narrative (and make the narrative more focused on an analysis of overall performance). This can also help illustrate progression to results in a more concrete fashion.

Critical aspects
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### Contribution and causality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengths, weaknesses and implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completeness and insight of conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Executive Feedback on Section D

The findings and conclusions are clear, though a more systematic approach to presenting them (similar to what was done in the effectiveness section) would have been helpful in terms of immediately understanding key messages. Conclusions are pitched at an appropriate level, but could have demonstrated a better balance of strengths and weaknesses.
SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Usefulness of recommendations</th>
<th>Appropriateness of recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</td>
<td>Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.</td>
<td>The recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>The recommendations and lessons learned are well formulated and actionable, as they aim to build on current project successes. Further, recommendations are aimed at different groups of stakeholders. However, more details could have been provided regarding the potential role of each UN Agency in implementing recommendations, and the numbering/format of the recommendations could have been clearer/more consistent. Lessons are relevant and logical, but in some cases could have been better contextualised within a wider perspective.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object.</td>
<td>The recommendations are separated into distinct sections (overall guiding principles, NBS, UN Partners), which helps make their implementation targeted toward specific stakeholders. More details could have been provided regarding the specific UN Agencies that could implement the recommendations, for instance. The recommendations are well framed within the context in Moldova, and mostly aim to build on lessons learned from this project experience. The evaluators indicate in the early section of the report that stakeholders took part in reviewing findings and recommendations, providing feedback that was integrated into the final report (p. 23, p. 24, p. 25, p. 26). This increases the recommendations' credibility and the likelihood that they will be adopted.</td>
<td>Recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</td>
<td>Recommendations should clearly state 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.</td>
<td>The recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</td>
<td>This includes: a) an understanding of the commissioning organisation b) awareness of the implementation constraints c) an understanding of the follow-up processes.</td>
<td>The recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Are lessons learned correctly identified?</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</td>
<td>Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied in contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.</td>
<td>The recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Recommendations bring together the main questions/issues highlighted in the analysis, and so are logically linked to the content of the report. Recommendations are mostly focused on an eventual new project of this type, which is directly related to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as stated in section 3.1. Recommendations are also few in number and presented using list format and bolded statements, though the numbering (order and format) in this section is inconsistent, which is confusing at times.</td>
<td>Evaluators may wish to precede each section of the recommendations with a table that lists the recommendations in relation to the stakeholders targeted for their implementation, in both the short and the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Feedback on Section E</td>
<td>Recommendations flow well from the analysis and relate directly to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Lessons are well formulated, but their application in other contexts could have been made clearer in some instances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating.</td>
<td>Up to two sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The opening pages contain some of the basic elements, including the name of the evaluated object and the date of the report, the name of the evaluators and the names of the commissioning organisations. The report also includes a list of acronyms and a table of contents. However, the location of the evaluated object is not provided, nor is a list of graphs and figures, which are both helpful pieces of information. The overall report's structure is very logical, with findings coming before lessons, conclusions and recommendations. The report's annexes contain appropriate information (notably interview questions, list of informants, 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Is the report logically structured?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The report is very well structured. The information provided is detailed and systematic, and key points are highlighted throughout. Though more information could have been provided on the report's cover page (especially the location of the evaluated object), the report's annexes contain useful information that adds credibility to the report. Overall, the report is somewhat longer than what the ToRs called for (53 pages of analysis vs. 30 pages). The executive summary is excellent: all the main elements are covered, and while this is useful in terms of creating a document that can stand alone and be informative, it may be less useful for decision-makers, who require an overview of the main points in just a few pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The executive summary provides an excellent, coherent and structured overview of the project and the report. All of the necessary elements are presented in significant detail (objectives, methodology, key findings, areas of success, lessons learned, and recommendations). As a result, the executive summary can certainly stand alone as a useful document. However, the length of the summary (12 pages) is excessive. Descriptions of key findings for the different criteria (i.e. effectiveness) are over a page long each. Though the summary is detailed and informative, its length may reduce its usefulness for decision-makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The executive summary should ideally be between two and three pages in order to ensure that decision-makers have easy access to key findings and recommendations. The executive summary is excellent: all the main elements are covered, and while this is useful in terms of creating a document that can stand alone and be informative, it may be less useful for decision-makers, who require an overview of the main points in just a few pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The report is well structured and systematic, containing all the elements required of a professional evaluation report. The opening pages, annexes and executive summary provide helpful information, though the executive summary could have been shortened to increase its usefulness for decision-makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The executive summary contains all the necessary elements, including: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names of the organisations commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including (tables, graphs, figures and annexes; List of acronyms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Can the executive summary stand alone?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It is important to include the location of the evaluated object in the report’s title/cover page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Can the executive summary inform decision making?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The executive summary should ideally be between two and three pages in order to ensure that decision-makers have easy access to key findings and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Is the report logically structured?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The report is very well structured. The information provided is detailed and systematic, and key points are highlighted throughout. Though more information could have been provided on the report's cover page (especially the location of the evaluated object), the report's annexes contain useful information that adds credibility to the report. Overall, the report is somewhat longer than what the ToRs called for (53 pages of analysis vs. 30 pages).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice.

**Additional Information**

**Remarks**

**Executive Feedback on Section F**

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

Up to two sentences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</td>
<td>The evaluation does an excellent job of addressing the ToRs - all of the criteria listed are used, and the evaluation is focused on future programming efforts, as requested. The length of the report is somewhat longer than what was called for, however (55 pages vs. 30 pages).</td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation to what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act?</td>
<td>Thanks in large part to a strong methodology, the report is based on solid evidence that generates logical findings and conclusions. Those flow into the recommendations, which are consequently that much more robust and credible.</td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</td>
<td>This report is very well done - its strengths are much more significant than its weaknesses. The evaluators may have considered highlighting UNICEF contributions as well as the specifics of the evaluation framework to a greater extent from the early sections of the report. In addition, findings could have been shortened and presented using bolded statements to drive home key messages. Similarly, conclusions could have been structured according to the evaluation criteria in order to better reflect the structure of the report and expand upon the analysis. Finally, lessons could have been better contextualised for wider application, and the executive summary could have been shortened considerably.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</td>
<td>The report's six sections hold together as a logical &quot;whole,&quot; with common threads woven throughout (e.g. human rights, social inclusion, capacity building).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Feedback on Overall Rating</td>
<td>This report is of high quality. Its strengths (methodology, theory of change, evaluation framework, recommendations) greatly surpass its minimal areas of weakness (presentation of findings and conclusions, wider application of lessons learned, length of the executive summary). It can be used with confidence for decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>