EVALUATION ID	#N/A

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Mostly Satisfactory	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding, best practice	Highly Satisfactory	Mostly Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section

The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

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

	Response				
Title of the Evaluation Report	**End of Programme Evaluation Rural Sanitation in Flood-affected Districts (RuSFAD Phase III) 2011-12**				
Report sequence number	2013/000	**Date of Review**	2/01/2014	**Year of the Evaluation Report**	2013
Region	South Asia Regional Office			**Country**	Pakistan
Type of Report	Evaluation			**TORs Present**	No
Name of reviewer	**Universalia Management Group**				

	Classification of Evaluation Report	Comments
Geographic Scope *(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)*	1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.	
Management of Evaluation *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)*	2.5. Country-led Evaluation: Evaluations managed by the Country (Government and/or CSO)	The report notes that the evaluation was commissioned by Water Aid Pakistan (p.20). We assume that evaluation process was then managed by WAP as well.
Purpose *(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)*	3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes	
Result *(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)*	4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme	The evaluation was expected to take stock of UNICEF efforts in achieving project outcomes.
MTSP Correspondence *(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)*	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (1. Young child survival & development)	
Level of Independence *(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)*	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.	
Approach	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme	

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION</th></tr>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>cc</th><th>Remarks</th><th colspan="2">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.</th><th>Constructive feedback for future reports
Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Object and context</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?
This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.</td><td>Outstanding</td><td rowspan="3">The object of the evaluation is very well described. A general overview is first presented which provides an overall picture of what the project was meant to address and lists a few key indicators (2, p.12). The components and their implementation modalities are presented in more details (2, pp.14-20) after the context is explained (2, pp.12-14). The contextual information provided have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation and link to the intervention of UNICEF and its partners.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?
The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level</td><td>Yes</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>3 Does this illuminate findings?
The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.</td><td>Yes</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Theory of Change</td><td rowspan="7">Highly satisfactory</td><td rowspan="7">The components of the project are well described, including a construction of the theory of change and logic model illustrating the links between different project components and articulating key assumptions. The stakeholders and their roles are also well defined.</td><td rowspan="7">The construction of a theory of change by the evaluation team when it was omitted in the project documents is an example of best practice. The theory of change figure (figure 2) could have been improved to better illustrate the different levels of results.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?
The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.</td><td>Yes</td><td>The report first describes the different components/pillars of the project (pp.14-15). Then, a reconstruction of the theory of change by the evaluators (as it was not defined in the project documents) is presented (2, pp.15-16). Although this remains mostly at the input and output level, the narrative explains adequately the logic of the intervention. Figure 2 somewhat illustrates this (p.16).</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Stakeholders and their contributions</td></tr>
<tr><td>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?
These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers</td><td>Outstanding</td><td rowspan="3">The description of the object evaluated introduces the different stakeholders and implementation partners. In particular, their roles and contributions are described in a specific sub-section (2, pp.17-18). The engagement of duty bearers as stakeholders (schools, local government) in this project is also mentioned in the description of the theory of change. In general, the contributions of UNICEF are sufficiently described. The financial contributions of UNICEF and Plan Pakistan are described (2, p.17). It is implied that they were the only two financial contributors.</td></tr>
<tr><td>6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described?
This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable</td><td>Outstanding</td></tr>
<tr><td>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?
This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific</td><td>Outstanding</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Implementation Status</td></tr>
</table>

8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Outstanding	The fact that the evaluation has been conducted at the end of the project is clearly presented. A calendar with the phases and their corresponding dates is presented at an early stage in the report.			

Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The object of the evaluation and the context of implementation are well described. The construction of a theory of change by the evaluation team (as it was omitted in the project document) is an example of best practice, but could have been substantiated with a more insightful figure.**

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE					
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?** The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.		**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Purpose, objectives and scope					
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Outstanding	The purpose of the evaluation is described in great length (3, p.21). The report specifies how the evaluation will be used and identifies its possible users. The report present the objectives and the scope (2, pp.21-22), but the key evaluation questions are not presented (these may be in an appendix, but the annexes are not available). The scope and objectives generally relate to the purpose.			
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Yes				
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes				
Evaluation framework					
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Outstanding	The evaluators briefly explain that they will use the five standard OECD/DAC criteria (also, as warranted in the TORs) and UNEG evaluation standards and that the basis for judging project effectiveness will be the project results matrix and comparison of results to baseline using KAP survey results. In addition, the information sought for each criteria is briefly described (3, p.22).	Highly satisfactory	The purpose of the evaluation is well defined at the outset of the report, along with its specific objectives and its scope. The key evaluation questions are missing, but the evaluation criteria are listed and align with the OECD/DAC standard ones as is explicitly mentioned in the report.	The report could be improved if the key evaluation questions were presented in the narrative. This could be complemented with an appendix that includes the Evaluation Matrix. (Although the list of Appendices suggest that this was the intention of the evaluation team, none of the appendices were submitted with the report.)
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	Yes				
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The purpose, the objectives, and the scope of the evaluation is well described in the report. The evaluators justify the evaluation criteria by the alignment with and direct reference to the standard OECD/DAC criteria. The key evaluation questions could have been included to substantiate this description.**				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY				
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**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*
Data collection				
14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.	Outstanding	The data collection methods and rationale for each method are presented in section 4 "Evaluation Methodology" (pp.23-25). This section also reviews the approach to sampling. The information sought through each collection method is described. The sources are also adequately identified. The evaluators do a good job of identifying the steps they will take for quality assurance in data collection. Although there are no explicit references to limitations of the data sources, the collection of data from a wide set of sources in an effort to triangulate information is clearly stated (4, p.23).		
15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits	Outstanding			
Ethics				
16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done	Mostly	Ethical considerations in the data collection process are specified (4, p.26). Evaluators describe their research practices, which all represent appropriate ethical considerations. However, ethical issues in the design of the project were not analyzed.		
17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors	Yes			
Results Based Management			**Highly satisfactory** The methodology used is appropriate for the task at hand. The use of mixed methods and sources approach is good practice. These methods and sources are well described. In addition, the evaluators, instead of a counterfactual, explain how they will try to determine contribution to results. Finally, efforts to mitigate limitations is apparent and the use of triangulation is mentioned explicitly. Although it indicates having taken a participatory approach to the evaluation process, the report provides limited	A clearer description of the types of participation of the different stakeholders in the evaluation process, as well as rationale for that type of participation, could have been provided to substantiate the claim that the evaluation process followed a participatory approach.
18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.	Yes	The evaluation comments on the quality of the M&E system, including the use of Third Party process monitoring. They comment on quality of LFA, indicators, and process monitoring. However, this information is often in different places in the report. The evaluators' use of the M&E framework, including baseline data and selected indicators, is appropriate.		
19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.	Yes			

explanation of how different types of stakeholders participated in the evaluation process.

Human Rights, Gender and Equity		
20 Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity? This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups	Yes	The evaluators include human rights style from the onset of the report. The human rights language is used. Rights-holders and duty-bearers are identified and the terminology is used throughout. In addition, some gender-sensitive considerations as well as some child -sensitive aspects. It also makes reference to the fulfilling of the rights. The human rights aspects of the project's components are motioned in the description of the object of the evaluation (pp.15-16). However, their integration in the monitoring framework of the project is not assessed. Although a human rights language is adopted, there is little analysis from a human rights perspective throughout the report, until the final chapter (8, pp.49-50). There is evidence of some gender-sensitive considerations throughout the report. In particular, the description of the methodology demonstrate that the evaluators' preoccupation to get the points of views of men, women, girls, and boys (4, pp.23, 24-25) and means through which that was ensured, such as hiring female facilitators. This effort cascades down to the findings section where there is reasonable use of gender disaggregated data and analysis that provides a gender perspective e.g. the assessment of the implementing partners to hire women to increase their reach of women beneficiaries (5, p.27). There is very little evidence of concerns for equity issues. One component of the project seems to have considered equity issues in its design (p.15). In addition, the evaluators signify their intent to collect the views of the most vulnerable population (p.23). However, there is no further evidence of this in the report.
21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks? UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.	Mostly	
22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)? The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations.	Mostly	
23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT? The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.	Yes	
24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY? The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.	No	

Stakeholder participation		
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.	Mostly	The report indicates that the evaluation was conducted using a participatory approach (4, p.23). The participation of UNICEF and WAP are briefly mentioned (p.22). However, the participation of other partners in the evaluation process (other than as a source of information) is not specified. It is not clear what role they have played in validating findings, etc.
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.	Mostly	
Methodological robustness		
27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.	Yes	There is no counterfactual built. However, this omission is both acknowledged and justified (3, p.22). Instead of a counterfactual, the report builds a historical comparison to try to assess the program's contribution (4, p.23). The methodology is adequate for the purpose of the evaluation. Some methodological limitations are described (4, pp.25-26). Their impact on the evaluation is described as well. Moreover, the report describes limitation mitigating strategies, such as the training of the data collectors (4, p.24).
28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.	Yes	
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	Outstanding	

Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The methodology is generally adequate for the purpose of the evaluation. Limitations inherent in the different methods and mitigating strategies are described. The description suggest that a wide set of data from diverse methods and sources will be used in unison to inform the findings.**

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS					
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?** Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.		**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Completeness and logic of findings					
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Yes	Section 5 presents the findings of the evaluation. The section is divided in subsections that addresses each of the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The findings are not always clearly presented with a distinctive visual cue that highlights them in the narrative. Nonetheless, findings statements can be differentiated from the supporting evidence in the narrative. Findings do not always clearly distinguish between outputs and outcome-level achievements. This problem is partially explained in the report as the result of the poor articulation of the results in the project document (pp.19-20). In the findings on effectiveness, some indicators with regard to the achievement of results as per the project results framework (as indicated on p.20) seem to be missing. In other words, the achievement of results/indicators presented in the description of the project (Table 1, p.17), is not fully addressed in the appraisal of effectiveness. Although the performance was included in the table, they should all have been assessed in depth in the effectiveness section. Some limitations in the availability of data are discussed at different points in the report (e.g. 2, pp.19-20; 3, p.21; etc.). No unexpected findings are discussed.	Highly satisfactory	The finding statements, although they are not clearly differentiated from the analysis with a distinctive visual cue, can be identified in the narrative. They address all the evaluation criteria mentioned in the description of the evaluation framework. They are derived from the evidence collected during the data collection process. The findings on effectiveness fall prey to the shortcomings in the definition of the log frame of the project. As such, the progression to results is not always clear. In addition, the report presents a list of indicator and their performance on those indicators in the description of the project, but does not address them significantly in the analysis. Nonetheless, the effectiveness of all the components of the project is assessed. The conclusions add little value. They very briefly restate some of the key findings of the analysis, without the supporting evidence. The little value added comes from the highlighting of some underlying problems that should be addressed.	A better presentation of the findings with a visual market would help readability. The use of bold or italics can help the reader to find the "key findings" or "messages" information in a more convivial manner. The conclusions should provide a more holistic overview of the main findings. The conclusions can add value by formulating appraisal statements in clear manner, highlighting the overall assessment of the evaluation criteria for instance.
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes				
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Mostly				
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes				
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	No				
Cost Analysis					
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.	Yes	A cost efficiency or value for money is presented in Table 2 (p.41). The comparison between the budgeted cost and the real cost was made. In addition, there is an attempt to construct a comparison point for cost per beneficiary and cost per household.			

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.	Mostly	The evaluation does not map results to the inputs of the different stakeholders, but the identification of the roles of the stakeholders in the early parts of the report somewhat mitigates this shortcoming. Some causal reasons are identified, but it is not done on a systematic basis.
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	
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	In the sustainability subsection of the findings we found the constraints for the continuity of the results achieved by the project. In general, the report does speak about different constraints facing operations, coordination among partners, use of Third Party monitors. The implications of these constraints are not always fully explored. The strengths and the weaknesses are addressed in the analysis and the conclusions.
39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.	Yes	
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 very succinctly summarize the main findings presented in the analysis. It highlights some underlying problems that should be addressed. They do not restate the key elements of evidence that informed these findings. As result, we can only infer that the views of stakeholders are reflected in the conclusions as those reflect the findings. They add little value as they are very brief.
41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.	Mostly	
42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).	Mostly	

Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The finding statements, although they are not differentiated from the narrative, can be identified in the text. They cover all the evaluation criteria selected and are supported with relevant evidence. The conclusions add little value by identifying a few underlying problems to concentrate on.**

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	**cc**	**Remarks**	**E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?** Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Relevance and clarity of recommendations				
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	The evaluators present two types of recommendations (7, pp.45-48). The first ones address the project in a general way and the second are specific for operational purposes. The recommendations are prioritized. The recommendations are for the most part based on evidence of the findings - however, there are a few exceptions such as Recommendation 2 which reflects a finding only briefly discussed in Section 8, presented after the recommendations.		
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes			
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Yes			
Usefulness of recommendations			**Highly satisfactory** Recommendation are correctly addressed and prioritized. They reflect issues identified in the analysis and they seem realistic and appropriate. Lessons learned presented do not add to the general body of knowledge. As such, although they are generalized and reflect findings presented in the analysis, they do not add much value.	Lessons learned should be based on observations made during the evaluation, but they should add to the general body of knowledge. Mere repetition of commonly accepted best practices should be avoided.
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Yes	The recommendations are addressed to one or more stakeholders. However, those addressed to implementing partners do not specify which implementing partner. They are realistic and appropriate to each stakeholder group.		
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Yes			
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No			
Appropriate lessons learned				
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	Mostly	Seven lessons learned are identified in the report (6, p.45). They are generalized, but they do not add to the general body of knowledge. Nonetheless, they reflect issues highlighted in the analysis.		
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.	Mostly			
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The evaluators present recommendation at two levels: policy and design, and operational recommendations. They are prioritized and correspond to the roles of each stakeholder. The lessons learned, although they are generalized, are not additions to the general body of knowledge.**			

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR</th></tr>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>cc</th><th>Remarks</th><th colspan="2">F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?
The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.</th><th>Constructive feedback for future reports
Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Style and presentation</td><td rowspan="11">Highly satisfactory</td><td rowspan="11">The structure of the report is generally adequate (with the placement of Chapter 8 as the exception). The language is appropriate for communicating to different audiences. Apart from some minor spelling problems the quality of the language is good.</td><td rowspan="11">The section on human rights and gender should have been presented after the analysis of the five evaluation criteria and could have been mentioned more clearly in the description of the evaluation framework.

In the appendices mentioned in the table of content should be provided at the end of the report or in an add-on volume.</td></tr>
<tr><td>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?
Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms</td><td>Outstanding</td><td>The basic elements are included in the early pages of the report, such as a complete table of content, a list of acronyms, the name of the object evaluated, the name of the evaluator organization, etc.</td></tr>
<tr><td>52 Is the report logically structured?
Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt</td><td>Yes</td><td>For the most part, the structure of the report is adequate, as indicated in the report the evaluators followed UNEG standards. The exception to this is the inclusion of section 8, which focuses on gender and human rights issues. This section comes at the very end of the report, after the recommendations.</td></tr>
<tr><td>53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?
Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report</td><td>No</td><td rowspan="2">The annexes, as per the list provided in the table of contents, are not included in the report. Although they may have provided useful information to complement the report had they been included, they are missing and thus cannot contribute to the usefulness or credibility of the report.</td></tr>
<tr><td>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Executive Summary</td></tr>
<tr><td>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?
If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A</td><td>Yes</td><td rowspan="4">The executive summary of three pages is complete. It contains the most important elements, such as a brief description of the object, the purpose, the objectives, etc. The inclusion of the policy and design recommendations will be useful.</td></tr>
<tr><td>56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?
Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>57 Can the executive summary stand alone?
It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>58 Can the executive summary inform decision making?
It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Executive Feedback on Section F
Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating.
Up to two sentences</td><td colspan="5">The structure of the report generally logical, except for one section of the analysis presented after the conclusions and the recommendations. Nevertheless, it reads well overall and is presented in a clear language.</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="6">Additional Information</th></tr>
<tr><th>Question</th><th colspan="5">Remarks</th></tr>
</table>

i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	TORs were not accessible.
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The description of the data collection process is an example of best practice.
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	N/A.

OVERALL RATING

Question	cc	Remarks		**OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?** This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act? Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Yes	Every section is strong, well presented, and easy to read. The readability of section 5 on findings could have been enhanced by the use of visual markers distinguishing the findings from the analysis. Conclusions (section 6) very succinctly summarize section 5, and does not add much insights. The recommendations are clearly structured. Section 8 is problematic as it should come earlier in the report, before conclusions, either integrated into the findings on the different criteria or as a separate chapter.	Highly satisfactory	In general, the evaluation met with the purpose and objectives specified in section 3. The findings are clearly derived from the data collected. The strength of the methodology brings confidence in the findings. However, a better reformulation of the conclusions and a presentation of the analysis of gender and human rights issues could have further improved the report. Nonetheless, overall the report is coherent and logically structured. It can be used with confidence.
ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Yes	Although, section 8 is misplaced, the overall report holds together and is coherent. Each section build on the strength of the previous one. In particular, the credibility of the analysis is enhanced by the thorough description of the data collection process.		
iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.	ToRs	Not accessible at the time of the review.		
	Other	N/A.		

Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**Overall, the report is coherent and logically structured. It can be used with confidence. The findings are based on sound evidence collected through a well thought out methodology.**