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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour Coding</th>
<th>CC Questions</th>
<th>Dark green</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section &amp; Overall Rating</td>
<td>Outstanding, best practice</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</strong></th>
<th><strong>UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Response**

**Title of the Evaluation Report**


**Report sequence number**

2014/012

**Date of Review**

19/06/2015

**Year of the Evaluation Report**

2014

**Region**

West and Central Africa Regional Office

**Country**

Nigeria

**Type of Report**

Evaluation

**TORs Present**

No

**Name of reviewer**

Universalia Management Group

**Geographic Scope**

(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)

1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.

**Management of Evaluation**

(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)

2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.

**Purpose**

(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d’être)

3.9 Impact Evaluation: An evaluation that looks at the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects on final beneficiaries produced by a development intervention. Impact evaluations assess the direct and indirect contributions of the intervention to specific development results, using robust quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods to assign contribution to higher level results.

**Result**

(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM; refer to substantial use of highest level reached)

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**

(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities: (1) Health; (2) HIV-AIDS; (3) WASH; (4) Nutrition; (5) Polio eradication; (6) Child Protection; (7) Social)

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
### Summary

An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarizes it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme.

### Level of Independence

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 summarizes it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme.

| Inclusion: (8) Cross-Cutting - Gender Equality; and (9) Cross-cutting - Humanitarian Action | b) Sanitation  
| | c) Hygiene  
| | d) WASH in schools and early childhood development centers  
| | e) WASH in humanitarian situations  

| Programme areas: | a) Water supply  
| | b) Sanitation  
| | c) Hygiene  
| | d) WASH in schools and early childhood development centers  
| | e) WASH in humanitarian situations  
| | (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)  

| SPOA Correspondence | (Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Object and context</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</td>
<td>There is insufficient information on the object of the evaluation. A general sense of the activities (p. 17), and the expected results (p. 14), are indicated, along with a general theory of change (p. 18). There is some information on programme beneficiaries and stakeholders but none on the costs of the programme. The program is contextualized to some extent by a background section on page 14, with information on water/sanitation access statistics globally, in Africa and in Nigeria. But there is not sufficient information provided about the WASH situation in the Nigerian context. For example, it is mentioned that wide disparities exist between the six regional areas but it does not explain this context. The context therefore only partially illuminates the findings.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</td>
<td>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 &amp; priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Does this illuminate findings?</td>
<td>The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION**

**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.

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*

**The report** provides some information on the WASH program and its context, but is insufficient to understand the program or its context well, for example, the socioeconomic disparities between the North and South. Some information on stakeholders is provided, but their contributions are not explained.

**Future reports** should include all key information on the context and the object of evaluation to fully illuminate the findings. It is important for the reader to know what the planned specific objectives, strategies, inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact were for this particular intervention in Nigeria.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Feedback on Section A</th>
<th>The report provides basic but inadequate information about the WASH program in Nigeria, and the Nigerian context, which would have further illuminated the findings on differences between WASH outcomes in the North and the South.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Up to two sentences*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</strong>&lt;br&gt;This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reasons for conducting the evaluation are presented, along with the intended purpose of identifying lessons learned for scaling up (p. 15). The report indicates how that information will be used in the future - to inform policy on the implementation of the next country program. The two main objectives of the evaluation are presented: 1) To determine the effectiveness of the WASH intervention and to identify what worked well and mechanisms that made it work, in order to learn and improve effectiveness for scaling up; 2) To assess the impact of the WASH interventions in order to identify opportunities to improve impact (p. 14). The scope of the evaluation is inadequately described in the scope section, and contains a confused discussion of how this impact evaluation will not assess impacts, but rather effects and outcomes, terms which it uses interchangeably, and does not explain how these relate to the 'goals' shown in the yellow diagram on page 15. It notes only the evaluation criteria that will be used. The objectives are realistic and related to the purpose. However, if we consider &quot;The type of information for the Impact Evaluation&quot; section on page 19 as part of scope, it is not clear whether this list will adequately address all the evaluation criteria (for example, there is no...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Most of the objectives are realistic and related to the purpose. However, if we consider &quot;The type of information for the Impact Evaluation&quot; section on page 19 as part of scope, it is not clear whether this list will adequately address all the evaluation criteria (for example, there is no...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Most of the objectives are realistic and related to the purpose. However, if we consider &quot;The type of information for the Impact Evaluation&quot; section on page 19 as part of scope, it is not clear whether this list will adequately address all the evaluation criteria (for example, there is no...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?**<br>The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.**

**Constructive feedback for future reports**<br>**Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</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>Mostly</td>
<td>The evaluation criteria were listed (pg. 15) and are the five main OECD/DAC criteria. However, in the pages after this list, it becomes unclear how all of these criteria will be addressed or that they will be addressed. The report does a poor job of explaining why an 'impact' evaluation will not be assessing impact.</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>Mostly</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating.</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The evaluators should provide a clear explanation of their approach to addressing the criteria, and a full description of scope that clearly addresses all those criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to two sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td>The report states the purpose of the evaluation and how the results of the evaluation will be used. The objectives are also clearly outlined, but there is insufficient description of the evaluation's scope, and a confusing explanation of what will be covered and how it will be addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods,</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The quantitative and qualitative data collection methods as well as data analysis methods are described (pp. 20-31). Qualitative tools, i.e. Most Significant Change tool and Participatory Assessment of Development tool, should have been more thoroughly described (pg. 22). In that same vein, the report describes that a &quot;theory based approach&quot; was utilized, but does not describe what specific theoretical framework it adopted (pg. 25). Sampling methods are partially described, although the reason for the selection of the six specific LGAs are not provided (pg. 20). Analytical methods are thoroughly described with justification given for their selection. Data sources are also identified, some rationale given for their selection, but their limitations are not fully described, e.g. limitations of self-reported health data (pg. 27-28), are not described till later on in the text (pg. 40-41, 97).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sampling methods and benchmarks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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,</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The report describes appropriate and expected ethical safeguards that were taken during the course of the evaluation, e.g. informed consent and ethics approval by the National Health Research Ethics Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and their limitations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy &amp; overcome data limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report describes appropriate and expected ethical safeguards that were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taken during the course of the evaluation, e.g. informed consent and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics approval by the National Health Research Ethics Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constructive feedback for future reports

Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>The M&amp;E systems of the Program are assessed (pg. 93) and deemed to be mostly conceptual in nature rather than operational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;E framework of the evaluated object?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring data was used to measure the level of intensity of interventions in each community (pg. 20-21). It also assessed the results based on some of the outcomes described in the program's theory of change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results Based Management**

The report describes the quantitative and qualitative and analytical methods used, although there are some details that are not fully described, such as what is meant exactly by the "theory-based approach" used. Although this was an impact evaluation, the ability to measure direct attribution of outcomes to the Program was hampered by the lack of baseline data and required the evaluation team to create a counterfactual using an approach of "high" and "low" intervention communities. Considering the constraints of the context, it was an acceptable method. That being said, the selected methodology did not allow for an assessment of the program's impact, with a lack of data collected from stakeholders other than beneficiaries. Limitations are described, but their explanation is spread throughout the report as opposed to being summarized in one location within the description of the report's summary.

Future reports should be sure to fully describe any background information necessary in order for the reader to best understand the methodology, e.g. provide explanations on the selection of certain tools or the specific theoretical framework underlying a "theory-based approach" to selecting participant communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No/Mostly Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF’s commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity? This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCR, 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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity &amp; child rights) frameworks? UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women &amp; child rights)? The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of right-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying &amp; structural causes of the non realisation of rights; Capacity development of right-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations. Support for humanitarian action – achieving faster scaling up of response, early identification of priorities and strategies, rapid deployment of qualified staff and clear accountabilities and responses consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of unrest or armed conflict.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT? The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying &amp; structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Does the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the MDG 7, whose goal is to ensure the right of all people to clean drinking water and proper sanitation. It also discusses equity related issues (rural vs. urban access, wealthy vs. poor access) and there is some discussion throughout the report related to gender and women’s empowerment.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT? The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying &amp; structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the 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.

The report describes how the programme related to the fulfillment of MDG 7, whose goal is to ensure the right of all people to clean drinking water and proper sanitation. It also discusses equity related issues (rural vs. urban access, wealthy vs. poor access) and there is some discussion throughout the report related to gender and women’s empowerment.

The report discusses the lack of a fully functional M&E framework but in this discussion it is not clear if the Program’s monitoring frameworks incorporate human rights and gender/equity elements (pg. 92-96).

There is some focus on human rights, gender, and equity incorporated into the evaluation’s methodology—although to various extents. This allowed some appropriate information to be collected. There is also acknowledgement and discussion of concern that the Program's functional M&E framework but in this discussion it is not clear if the Program's monitoring frameworks incorporate human rights and gender/equity elements. Although there is information presented on women's empowerment and human rights in each section of the report, it appears that an assessment of equity was the primary focus of the evaluation and subsequently, there is more information on issues related to equity that cascade through the whole report.
Future reports should be sure to fully describe any background information necessary in order for the reader to best understand the methodology, e.g., provide explanations on the selection of certain tools or the specific theoretical framework underlying a “theory-based approach” to selecting participant communities.

The report describes how the programme related to the fulfillment of MDG 7, whose goal is to ensure the right of all people to clean drinking water and proper sanitation. It also discusses equity-related issues (rural vs. urban access, wealthy vs. poor access) and there is some discussion throughout the report related to gender and women’s empowerment.

The report discusses the lack of a fully functional M&E framework but in this discussion it is not clear if the Program’s monitoring frameworks incorporate human rights and gender/equity elements (pg. 92-96). There is some focus on human rights, gender, and equity incorporated into the evaluation’s methodology—although to various extents. This allowed some appropriate information to be collected. There is also acknowledgement and discussion of concern that the Program did not select beneficiaries most in need, but instead communities that were “low hanging fruit” (p. 109).

Although there is information presented on women’s empowerment and human rights in each section of the report, it appears that an assessment of equity was the primary focus of the evaluation and subsequently, there is more information on issues related to equity that cascade through the whole report.

Mostly Satisfactory

The report describes the quantitative and qualitative and analytical methods used, although there are some details that are not fully described, such as what is meant exactly by the “theory-based approach” used. Although this was an impact evaluation, the ability to measure direct attribution of outcomes to the Program was hampered by the lack of baseline data and required the evaluation team to create a counterfactual using an approach of “high” and “low” intervention communities. Considering the constraints of the context, it was an acceptable method. That being said, the selected methodology did not allow for an assessment of the program’s impact, with a lack of data collected from stakeholders other than beneficiaries. Limitations are described, but their explanation is spread throughout the report as opposed to being summarized in one location within the description of the report’s summary.

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

The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development.
Stakeholder participation

25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?
Yes

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: a Liaison, a Technical advisory, an Observer, or Active decision making. The reviewer should look for the soundness of the design 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?
Yes

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/ attribution?
Yes

Due to the fact that there was no baseline data, a before-after comparison was not possible. Instead, a comparison group was created through which the evaluation sought to address issues of contribution/attribution (pg. 28). The heavy focus put on this method of collecting evidence was robust enough to provide evidence for some of the selected evaluation criteria (the specific evaluation questions are unknown to this reviewer). However, the methodology did not appear to gather views of all stakeholder groups, instead seeming to focus on the beneficiary sample. It is not evident that any views of management or other partners were gathered or taken into account. Triangulation of data is not always clear due to the lack of integration from different lines of evidence.

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

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?
Modify

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

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

Up to two sentences

The evaluation team appeared to have put great efforts into using comparison groups to assess the results of the program, as baseline data was lacking. While this method was appropriate, the methodology appeared to neglect gathering the views of other stakeholders outside beneficiaries. The description of the methodology would have benefitted from a clearer explanation of the “theory-based approach”. 
## SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Completeness and logic of findings</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence &amp; sound analysis?</th>
<th>Constructive feedback for future reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The report does not clearly articulate what the findings are in the main body of the report. Rather than presenting a finding for a question or topic, it relays considerable detail from various lines of evidence, often without summarizing or highlighting the related finding (sometimes the findings is clearly stated, but lost somewhere in the middle of the text). Findings that have been articulated are supported by evidence. The report further switches back and forth between discussing results in control and intervention communities, which makes it hard to follow the 'story' of the evaluation (pg. 33-34).</td>
<td>Mostly Satisfactory. The correct ToRs are missing from this document, so we are unable to conclude whether all evaluation questions have been covered. The report more or less addresses all of the evaluation criteria, some not very thoroughly, and provides a confusing explanation of how it is covering (or not) effects, outcomes, and impacts. The results chapter frequently does not clearly articulate the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.</td>
<td>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</td>
<td>Mostly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</td>
<td>Mostly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Mostly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings should be clearly articulated, and presented in a more concise and organized manner with all lines of evidence integrated into an overall analysis. A clear explanation of why the approach to the criteria deviates from what would normally be expected should be provided.
The report does not clearly articulate what the findings are in the main body of the report. Rather than presenting a finding for a question or topic, it relays considerable detail from various lines of evidence, often without summarizing or highlighting the related finding (sometimes the findings is clearly stated, but lost somewhere in the middle of the text). Findings that have been articulated are supported by evidence.

The report further switches back and forth between discussing results in control and intervention communities, which makes it hard to follow the 'story' of the evaluation (pg. 33-34).

As the correct ToRs have NOT been included in the report, we cannot confirm what the evaluation questions were. The report states that the criteria included relevance, appropriateness of design, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome/impact, and sustainability. However, the report seems confused about what counts as effectiveness, outcomes, and impacts, and whether it is addressing impacts or not. Efficiency (p 95) and relevance (p 92-93) are not well dealt with, though not ignored.

The report gives some indication throughout the results section on how the Program's results were achieved.

The report makes a good effort to contextualize some of the findings in terms of the limitations of the data (a smaller sample size than originally envisioned, and other methodological constraints), and cautions the reader on interpreting the data (e.g., pg. 40).

Some unexpected findings are presented, such as an unusually high diarrhea prevalence in children under 5 (pg. 80), though a further exploration of why this might be would have been needed.

The report provides some indication throughout the results section on how the Program's results were achieved. The report makes a good effort to contextualize some of the findings in terms of the limitations of the data (a smaller sample size than originally envisioned, and other methodological constraints), and cautions the reader on interpreting the data (e.g., pg. 40).

Some unexpected findings are presented, such as an unusually high diarrhea prevalence in children under 5 (pg. 80), though a further exploration of why this might be would have been needed.

It is not possible to verify that no cost analysis was specifically requested in the TOR, however, no explanation about costs or lack of a cost analysis is provided.

Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are unexpected findings discussed?</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>The report gives some indication throughout the results section on how the Program's results were achieved. Some unexpected findings are presented, such as an unusually high diarrhea prevalence in children under 5 (pg. 80), though a further exploration of why this might be would have been needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>It is not possible to verify that no cost analysis was specifically requested in the TOR, however, no explanation about costs or lack of a cost analysis is provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Contribution and causality

36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?

For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.

**Yes**

There is a section discussing how UNICEF’s contribution to the Program was relevant and appropriate (pg. 92-95). There is also additional discussion throughout the report of how other stakeholders contributed to the results.

37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?

These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust.

*This is an extremely important question to UNICEF*

**Mostly**

The contextual factors contributing to accomplishments and failures, as well as some elements of program approach, are discussed in Section 3 of the report (pg. 88-96). They appear to be based on evidence but are not concisely presented, and lack a clear overall message.

### Strengths, weaknesses and implications

38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?

The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.

**Yes**

The various risks to the program’s sustainability (institutional, technical, socio-economic, and social-cultural) are discussed.

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.

**Mostly**

Some of the strengths and weaknesses of the Program are presented, especially on pages 92-93. This could have been done more thoroughly, however, without the TORs, it is unclear to what extent the program design or implementation was to be evaluated.

### Completeness and insight of conclusions

40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?

Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.

**Mostly**

The conclusions present a nice summary of the findings. But there is limited further insight provided (pg. 109). The discussion section, which could have been used to go beyond the findings, is somewhat repetitive of text found.
| 41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? | Mostly acceptable | The views derived from focus groups do come out in the conclusion, but it is not clear whether any views have been incorporated from other types of stakeholders (pg. 104). |
| 42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? | Mostly acceptable | The conclusion is reasonably short, and written in plain language; this will serve some users. However, the discussion is not focused on the higher level of messaging and insight that would be needed by a management level. |

**Executive Feedback on Section D**

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

*Up to two sentences*

The report does not clearly articulate its findings in the main body of the report, although evidence is provided to support those that are articulated. Overall, it does tell a coherent story as the report fails to integrate data from the various lines of evidence to provide an overall analysis. The conclusions help to provide a summary of the findings section, but offer limited further insight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</th>
<th>Constructive feedback for future reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The recommendations logically stem from the previously presented evidence and conclusions. They also are relevant to the purpose of the evaluation, though some are vague.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>In order to increase the likelihood that recommendations will be followed up on, it is good practice to clearly identify specific target groups for action with each recommendation. Prioritization schemes should also be used if there are more than five recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The recommendations are clearly written but are not prioritized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the next</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>None of the recommendations are clearly targeted at a specific group for action. Despite this, they are realistic in terms of the evaluation's context. But there is no discussion of how the recommendations were developed or if any of the stakeholders participated with their development.</td>
<td>The recommendations provided are relevant given the context of the evaluation. They logically stem from the presented evidence. But it is not clear if they were developed with stakeholders' input. They are not presented with clear target groups for action or with a sense of prioritization. Lessons learned were not provided nor was it mentioned why they were not provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None of the recommendations are clearly targeted at a specific group for action. Despite this, they are realistic in terms of the evaluation's context. But there is no discussion of how the recommendations were developed or if any of the stakeholders participated with their development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None of the recommendations are clearly targeted at a specific group for action. Despite this, they are realistic in terms of the evaluation's context. But there is no discussion of how the recommendations were developed or if any of the stakeholders participated with their development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None of the recommendations are clearly targeted at a specific group for action. Despite this, they are realistic in terms of the evaluation's context. But there is no discussion of how the recommendations were developed or if any of the stakeholders participated with their development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None of the recommendations are clearly targeted at a specific group for action. Despite this, they are realistic in terms of the evaluation's context. But there is no discussion of how the recommendations were developed or if any of the stakeholders participated with their development.</td>
<td>The recommendations provided are relevant given the context of the evaluation. They logically stem from the presented evidence. But it is not clear if they were developed with stakeholders' input. They are not presented with clear target groups for action or with a sense of prioritization. Lessons learned were not provided nor was it mentioned why they were not provided.</td>
<td>In order to increase the likelihood that recommendations will be followed up on, it is good practice to clearly identify specific target groups for action with each recommendation. Prioritization schemes should also be used if there are more than five recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E</strong> Executive Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating.</em></td>
<td>The recommendations provided are relevant given the context of the evaluation. But they were not provided with clearly identified target groups for action or with prioritization. There are no lessons learned provided or an explanation of why lessons learned were not included in the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

*Up to two sentences*
**SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Constructive feedback for future reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The opening pages include the basic elements.</td>
<td>In future, such a report should focus more on presenting an analysis of data provided to create a coherent 'story' of the evaluation, rather than an exhaustive and repetitive presentation of data. All lines of evidence should be integrated into the analysis, which should then communicate clear findings from the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>The overall components of the report are logically ordered. However, the important 'Results' section is poorly structured. The topics within this section are not discussed in a logical order (e.g., pg 39 'Effects on Water' includes quite diverse topics such as the number of water sources and the capacity of government partners to deliver WASH services). Within each sub-section, results have been discussed according to the source of data (primary qualitative data, secondary quantitative data, etc), and does not allow for integration of this information into a coherent message. The 'Results' chapter is overly long as a result of repeating details from focus groups, rather than bringing this data up to a higher level of analysis and presenting clear findings, based on all data sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52 Is the report logically structured?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The general outline of the report is logically structured in the sense that the context of the evaluation and explanation of the evaluation’s objectives, scope and methodology come before the findings and conclusions. But the report lacks clarity within each section and the large amount of repetition of information decreases the report’s readability and leaves findings unclear. The annexes contain useful information, though contain the wrong ToRs. The executive summary provides a reasonable summary and is an appropriate length, but still does not contain an overall higher-level analysis and includes one important item that is not explained in the report.</td>
<td>In future, such a report should focus more on presenting an analysis of data provided to create a coherent 'story' of the evaluation, rather than an exhaustive and repetitive presentation of data. All lines of evidence should be integrated into the analysis, which should then communicate clear findings from the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</strong></td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Executive Summary

**54. Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?**
- Mostly

Details from focus groups, rather than bringing this data up to a higher level of analysis and presenting clear findings, based on all data sources.

The annex in Vol. 1 of the report includes a copy of a TOR, but it is for another project ("Evaluation of the Maternal Neonatal and Child Health Week in Nigeria from 2010-2014"), thus we are unable to assess whether all elements of the study were covered. The annexes in Vol. 2 provide appropriate elements, such as in-depth interview protocols, sampling protocols, and informed consent forms, but the household survey is not accessible through the linked pdf icon.

Furthermore, there are elements, e.g. list of interviewees, missing that would have improved the credibility of the report.

---

**55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?**
- Yes

There was an executive summary included in the report, which presented the necessary elements (evaluation objectives, methodology, most important findings, conclusions, and recommendations, etc.). It was of a reasonable length (4 pages) and provides a good summary of the report, but could be improved with the inclusion of a higher level summary. It is also mentioned that the program contributed to a 3% decrease in diarrhea, but how this conclusion was obtained is not discussed in the report.

---

**56. Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?**
- Yes

Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations

---

**57. Can the executive summary stand alone?**
- Mostly Satisfactory

It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments.

---

**58. Can the executive summary inform decision making?**
- Mostly

It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.
The overall framework of the report is structured in a logical manner, but the structure of the results chapter is confusing and does not communicate findings clearly. The report lacks clarity and readability due to large amount of repetition between sections. The executive summary is a reasonable summary, but requires the reader to reference the rest of the report or other documents to fully understand it.

### Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</td>
<td>It is unclear if the report fully addressed the TOR because the TOR attached to the end of Vol. 1 (pg. 114), are the TOR for a different evaluation project: &quot;ToR for the Evaluation of the Maternal Neonatal and Child Health Week in Nigeria, from 2010 to 2014&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation</td>
<td>The evaluation team put great efforts into creating and using comparison groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Although the evidence generated from the methodology appears useful and credible, the evaluation does a poor job of presenting an integrated analysis of this data that would communicate clear messages about the findings. The conclusions and recommendations generally reflect the evidence presented, but the poor structure and confusing explanations about the evaluation approach do not inspire confidence in the evaluation in general, although the evidence presented appears robust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evaluation appears to have produced some credible evidence despite large challenges in assessing impact without baseline data. However, the evaluation does a poor job of explaining its approach and articulating its findings. It puts great emphasis on relaying data separately from each line of evidence, without always providing clear findings or judgments about that data. Additionally, the report does not go far enough in questioning the reasons for the data it found. The evaluation still provides information that could be useful to UNICEF strategic management, but could have benefitted from an extensive edit, more analysis of the data presented, and the inclusion of more sources of data (such as the views of stakeholders other than beneficiaries). The ToRs are not available to the reviewer so the extent to which it met those ToRs cannot be confirmed. The report addresses...
**Executive Feedback on Overall Rating**

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

*Up to two sentences*

| II/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? | Mostly | The sections are generally logically consistent, but are unclear in terms of how they are addressing certain criteria. | Mostly Satisfactory

The evaluation put considerable effort into a methodology to generate credible evidence in the face of challenges such as not having baseline data. This evidence has been presented without an integrated analysis from all lines of evidence, and does not produce clear messages about the findings. The evaluation would have benefitted from an analysis of data from other stakeholders besides beneficiaries, a deeper questioning of the causal reasons for the data from the comparison groups, and a clearer explanation about how it went about addressing the criteria. The recommendations are not targeted and sometimes vague. |