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

**Title of the Evaluation Report:** UNICEF WCARO Real Time Independent Assessment (RTIA) of UNICEF’s Response to the Sahel Food and Nutrition Crisis, 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Geographical</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation findings)</td>
<td>Senegal region covers multiple countries within the region and the sampling is adequate to make the results generalizable to the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management of Evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</td>
<td>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d’être)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.</td>
<td>3.4 Real-time-evaluation: In the context of an emergency, an evaluation of the efficacy of the response, which collates lessons that can be applied back to an on-going response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong></td>
<td><strong>MTSP Correspondence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM; refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</td>
<td>(Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children’s rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>5.2 Multi-sectoral: Addresses issues in two or more MTSP focus areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Independence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</td>
<td>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTSTANDING

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

The object of the evaluation is clearly described and supported by detailed but succinct background and contextual information, including the objective of the response; UNICEF’s role and mandate in the Sahel crisis; its contributions in terms of humanitarian assistance and regional coordination; response areas; the countries involved; and the costs associated with the effort. Information on governments, RO and CO assistance priorities, and social, institutional and economic factors that have a direct bearing on the effectiveness of the response are also discussed. Stakeholder contributions are referenced throughout the report.

OUTSTANDING

Although a theory of change in this case would not be applicable, the report mentions what UNICEF’s response intended to achieve by providing targets (p.28).

N/A

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 object of the evaluation – UNICEF’s response to the nutritional crisis in the Sahel region – is clearly described in the Background and Justification section of the report (pp. 13-14). Descriptive elements include the roles UNICEF’s role in the lead-up to the crisis; the chain of events that led to the situation in 2011-12; UNICEF’s response (i.e., actions pursued); the number of countries, people and children affected; and the costs of addressing the problem. The context is partly mentioned in the first paragraphs of the Background section, and explored in detail in the first section of the findings (pp. 19-20). It includes more specific information on the institutional, gender, social and economic-related context of the Sahel region, which directly or indirectly contributed to the emerging food crisis. Surprisingly however, other than the mention of “poor rains” (p.13), biophysical factors, human-environment interactions, and land-use decisions that can aggravate or exacerbate drought conditions are altogether absent from the Background and Context sections. Nevertheless, contextual elements are treated as findings in their own right and inferences to the overall context are discussed in other dimensions of the section on findings (e.g., “needs assessment”) and in the Discussion that follows (pp. 44-45).

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.

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.
| 5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? | Key stakeholders are identified in part in the Methodology (e.g., WFP, WHO, FAO, ACF, MSF, SCF, Oxfam, CRF, OCHA, ECHO, and IFRC) and across the section on findings. Together, they represent a broad range of interests associated with CSOs, NGOs, government, donors, and UN-related agencies. While stakeholder contributions are discussed throughout the report, and include technical, financial, and humanitarian-related assistance, the report does not offer a condensed view of individual efforts and their relationship to emerging relief efforts in the Sahel (e.g., table of key partners). With regards to UNICEF’s contributions, the agency’s work and its contributions at the country and regional and even international levels (e.g., awareness/fund raising) form the central object of the evaluation and are discussed at length throughout the report. |
| 6 Are key stakeholders’ contributions described? | Stakeholder contributions are referenced throughout the report. |
| 7 Are UNICEF contributions described? | Key stakeholders are identified in part in the Methodology (e.g., WFP, WHO, FAO, ACF, MSF, SCF, Oxfam, CRF, OCHA, ECHO, and IFRC) and across the section on findings. Together, they represent a broad range of interests associated with CSOs, NGOs, government, donors, and UN-related agencies. While stakeholder contributions are discussed throughout the report, and include technical, financial, and humanitarian-related assistance, the report does not offer a condensed view of individual efforts and their relationship to emerging relief efforts in the Sahel (e.g., table of key partners). With regards to UNICEF’s contributions, the agency’s work and its contributions at the country and regional and even international levels (e.g., awareness/fund raising) form the central object of the evaluation and are discussed at length throughout the report. |
| 8 Is the implementation status described? | The real-time assessment was design to take place just after the first phase of the response, in order to inform decisions during the second part of the intervention (p.14). |

**Executive Feedback on Section A**

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

The evaluation provides detail on the context of the interventions, including a detailed description on the social, economic, and institutional factors at the regional level. The description of UNICEF’s response to the humanitarian crisis was also clearly explained, although more detail on the key partners and their role in the response to the emerging Sahel crisis could have been highlighted.
### SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

<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>Outstanding</td>
<td>The purpose of the evaluation is clearly stated on p.14 (i.e., to gain an impartial perspective on the adequacy of UNICEF’s response to the crisis, whether integrated response plans are aligned with the CCCs, and whether resources are being used efficiently). The objectives and scope of the RTIA are presented in the section titled accordingly (p.14), which points to the reasons for the evaluation, the areas of inquiry covered by the assessment, and scope-related focus on UNICEF’s nutrition response. The objectives and scope boundaries logically support, and are linked to, the purpose of the evaluation.</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>Outstanding</td>
<td>The purpose of the evaluation is clearly stated on p.14. The objectives and scope of the evaluation are presented in the section titled accordingly (p.14), which points to the reasons for the evaluation, the areas of inquiry covered by the assessment, and scope-related focus on UNICEF’s nutrition response. The objectives and scope boundaries logically support, and are linked to, the purpose of the evaluation.</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>Outstanding</td>
<td>The purpose of the evaluation sets a clear rationale for the RTIA, and is paired with a sound basis for the overall assessment. However, the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are rigorously defined and provide a realistic rationale for the RTIA. The purpose of the evaluation is clearly stated on p.14 (i.e., to gain an impartial perspective on the adequacy of UNICEF’s response to the crisis, whether integrated response plans are aligned with the CCCs, and whether resources are being used efficiently). The objectives and scope of the RTIA are presented in the section titled accordingly (p.14), which points to the reasons for the evaluation, the areas of inquiry covered by the assessment, and scope-related focus on UNICEF’s nutrition response. The objectives and scope boundaries logically support, and are linked to, the purpose of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 purpose, objective and scope of the evaluation are explained in detail and it allows the audience to understand the reasoning behind the need for an assessment. Overall, the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are rigorously defined and provide a realistic basis for the overall assessment. However, even though evaluative criteria were in part drawn from the TORs and further refined in collaboration with the AMG, the text fails to explain the reasons that motivated such a selection and how these in turn relate to the purpose of the evaluation.</td>
<td>Highly satisfactory</td>
<td>The purpose, objective and scope of the evaluation are explained in detail and it allows the audience to understand the reasoning behind the need for an assessment. However, minimal attention is given to the evaluation framework, including the reasons for choosing additional criteria that were not included in the TORs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</strong>&lt;br&gt;The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard DAC evaluation criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>The evaluative dimensions considered in the assessment are outlined in the methodology section (p.16). While these were based on the requirements of the TORs and refined in collaboration with the Assessment Management Group (AMG) that was created to oversee the assessment process, thus suggesting the use of a rigorous justificatory process, the rationale or reasoning behind the chosen criteria is not expressed in the report itself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section B**<br>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive & negatives), & justify rating, (250 to 300 words).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods,</td>
<td></td>
<td>The report not only identifies the data collection methods and sources, but also provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sampling methods and benchmarks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>detailed explanations for why these methods and sources were selected. For each of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>methods identified, the report outlines the activities and/or processes involved and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strategies used to validate conclusions, including the use of participatory measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(debriefing meetings) to validate findings at the country and regional levels (pp. 15-17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit reference to the diversity of selected sources of data is emphasised throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the section, including country office and WCARO staff, key informants from other UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agencies, NGOs, governments, donors and beneficiaries. Limitations pertaining to sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and data availability are specified (pp. 18-19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection, and their limitations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The report does not explicitly mention any ethical issues or considerations with regards to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the design of the programme (not included in TORs) nor the design of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues described?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results Based Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring system adequately assessed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The evaluation looked specifically at the Humanitarian Performance Monitoring (HPM) system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>used by the COs to measure the progress of the response (p. 27). The HPM assessment includes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a detailed critique of the selected performance indicators (p.28-29). The reliability of some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the targets listed in the framework are compared to results measured during the RTIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(pp. 40-41) and the relevance and limitations of the system with regards to the strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planning needs of UNICEF are considered in the findings (e.g., p. 25) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recommendations (e.g., p. 44).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

The report should inform its audience of the ethical dimensions that were considered in the design of data collection methods, especially with regards to beneficiary group discussions. With respect to human rights based approaches and equity, the evaluation should either highlight these aspects more prominently in the findings or provide a brief explanatory account in the methodology of the terms and approach used as proxies to these considerations within the body of the report.

To this end, greater clarity of the methodological approach would have been achieved by including section on the strategy used to assess HRBA, gender and equity aspects.

Finally, in order for the audience to understand the link between the evaluative criteria, assessment questions, data collection methods and performance indicators, it would have been helpful to include the evaluation matrix referenced in the report (p. 16), as well as the data collection instruments themselves.

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.

Highly satisfactory

The report provides detailed descriptions of the methods used to collect data and fulfill the objectives of the RTIA. Detailed explanations of the methods chosen highlight the importance of stakeholder participation, not only in terms of providing evaluative data, but also with respect to the validation of findings and the formulation/prioritization of the recommendations. The methodology sheds light on the wide variety of perspectives taken into account to strengthen the reliability/validity of the assessment, and control for bias. Finally, the report provides a detailed assessment of the Humanitarian Performance Monitoring system used by country offices, including a critical analysis of the indicators used to monitor progress towards improved situational outcomes.

In terms of the RTIA’s inclusiveness of Human Rights Based approaches, including gender and equity considerations, the evaluation falls short of directly (and explicitly) incorporating a human rights framework in its methodological approach. However, this is in large compensated by the evaluation’s marked commitment to gender and child-sensitive analysis, and the special needs vulnerable populations (including

Humanitarian Performance Monitoring system used by country offices, including a critical analysis of the indicators used to monitor progress towards improved situational outcomes.

In terms of the RTIA’s inclusiveness of Human Rights Based approaches, including gender and equity considerations, the evaluation falls short of directly (and explicitly) incorporating a human rights framework in its methodological approach. However, this is in large compensated by the evaluation’s marked commitment to gender and child-sensitive analysis, and the special needs vulnerable populations (including
**Human Rights, Gender and Equity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Does the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women &amp; child rights)?</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Does the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENTS?</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methodology does not identify any particular framework or benchmark to assess evidence of human rights-based approaches, gender equality or equity, but it includes the perspectives of beneficiaries (mothers) and indicates a 6:5 consultation ratio of male and female respondents. Gender is featured as a cross-cutting issue that transcends the overall report. Gender-related concerns are raised in nearly every dimension analysed, including the appropriateness of the emergency response and HPM system (e.g., see findings 3, 7, 28, 48, 55, 63, 67). Finally, gender equality is integrated in the discussion (p. 49) and as a cross-cutting issue that needs to be more fully addressed in the response (i.e., Recommendation 7). The appropriateness, relevance and effectiveness of the emergency response, relative to the needs of children, form the central focus of UNICEF’s response and that of the evaluation itself. Issues related to equity and vulnerable populations (e.g., people living with disabilities, HIV/AIDS) are addressed in the findings (e.g., 7, 8, 32, 45, 50, 64, 65), discussion (p. 49) and recommendations (e.g., 1 and 7).

In terms of the RTIA’s inclusiveness of Human Rights and gender equality frameworks, the evaluation falls short of directly (and explicitly) incorporating a human rights framework in its methodological design of data collection methods, especially human rights-related indicators. It does not present a human rights-based approach in the evaluation methodology, nor do the findings or recommendations provide a detailed assessment of the extent to which the implementation of the human rights standards are addressed in the findings (e.g., 7, 8, 32, 45, 50, 64, 65). The human rights framework or benchmark to assess evidence of human rights-based approaches, gender equality or equity, is not used by country offices, including a critical consideration within the body of the report.

To this end, greater clarity of the methods and performance indicators, it would have been helpful to include the evaluation matrix limits the ability to the reader to link the approach used to the questions of the assessment.

Finally, in order for the audience to understand the extent to which the evaluation design and style considered 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, CEDAW and other related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.
### Stakeholder participation

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

**26. Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?**
The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.

### Methodological robustness

**27. Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/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. The best way to establish a counterfactual in this case would be by asking the beneficiaries that were not reached themselves. But since Real-Time Assessments are implemented at the moment of the humanitarian intervention, and since the purpose of humanitarian action is to reach as many people as possible, it would be unethical to use resources to consult with unreached beneficiaries, instead of using resources to provide them with their basic needs. Therefore the establishment of a counterfactual is N/A.

According to the methodology (p.16), "an evidence-based matrix was created in order to establish the chain of evidence when entering data and to ensure an evidence-based construction of findings and conclusions..." However, the report failed to include this instrument, either in the body of the text or as an annex. Presumably, this would have provided a useful synthesis to help understand how the methodology links to the evaluation questions. Even though this relationship is somewhat implicit in the methodology section, the framework would have given the reader a much greater sense of the evaluation’s internal logic.

Even though this relationship is somewhat implicit in the methodology section, the framework would have given the reader a much greater sense of the evaluation’s internal logic.

**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. The best way to establish a counterfactual in this case would be by asking the beneficiaries that were not reached themselves. But since Real-Time Assessments are implemented at the moment of the humanitarian intervention, and since the purpose of humanitarian action is to reach as many people as possible, it would be unethical to use resources to consult with unreached beneficiaries, instead of using resources to provide them with their basic needs. Therefore the establishment of a counterfactual is N/A.

According to the methodology (p.16), "an evidence-based matrix was created in order to establish the chain of evidence when entering data and to ensure an evidence-based construction of findings and conclusions..." However, the report failed to include this instrument, either in the body of the text or as an annex. Presumably, this would have provided a useful synthesis to help understand how the methodology links to the evaluation questions. Even though this relationship is somewhat implicit in the methodology section, the framework would have given the reader a much greater sense of the evaluation’s internal logic. Methodological limitations are successfully incorporated in the methodology and are reasonable for the task at hand, as the evaluators recognized some efforts in limiting bias and problems related to timing and sampling constraints, and data accessibility (p.16.)
29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?

Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings.

Executive Feedback on Section C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. Up to two sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The methodology section provides a detailed description of the methods used to collect data, the rationale supporting these various approaches, and the means used to ensure stakeholder participation with respect to the validation of RTIA findings, conclusions, and recommendations. While concern for human rights - including gender, equity, and the rights of women and children in particular - are prominently discussed throughout the report, the methodology does not clearly specify how human rights-based considerations were taken into account in the design and implementation of the assessment.
### Completeness and logic of findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>cc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the</td>
<td>The report uses a narrative approach for the presentation of evaluative findings, followed by succinct summaries of the key insights relevant to each of the dimensions explored in the text, which the report refers as “conclusions” in the boxed-text of each section. Overall, this approach works well and allows the authors to capture the breadth of evidence and considerations that informed each of the sections, while highlighting the substantive elements that the readers needs to remember. For the most part, findings are supported by hard evidence, such as the estimation of caseloads (pp. 23-24), the quality of the indicators used to monitor the performance of humanitarian assistance (p.28), or the views of stakeholders . In some instances however, findings appear to be based on anecdotal evidence (e.g., finding 30). Minimal use of citations could, moreover, weaken confidence in the reliability of some of discussed information. The findings address all of the criteria listed in the methodology. However, given that additional dimensions were added to the assessment as part of the initial planning phase of the RTIA - beyond those stated in the TORs, including context, preparedness and planning, connectedness, and response - the absence of a detailed summary of key questions or evaluation framework makes it unclear what the focus of these additional issues consists of. This in turn makes it harder to assess the extent to which key evaluation issues and questions were fully addressed. An introductory paragraph at the beginning of each subsection on findings would have provided additional clarity in this regard. Distinguishing between outputs and outcomes in the context of a real-time evaluation would not be relevant in this case as the results are mainly at the activity and output level (e.g., number of children reached, number of caseloads reported, etc.). In the limitations section, the report mentions that “Most of the data requested was made available to the consultants, but in some cases, data dependent on local counterparts was missing or incomplete” (p.19). However, it is unclear how this may have affected the quality of the findings. The report does not specify any unexpected finding.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported evidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation’s stated criteria and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions?</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>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the</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>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</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>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 Are unexpected findings discussed?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the need to assess the efficiency of resource use and the cost-effectiveness of scale-up efforts are underscored in the rationale of the evaluation and efficiency-related questions outlined in the TORs, cost-related factors are mentioned in only a few findings (e.g., 60-61) and the RTIA does not present any substantive analysis of costs, relative to the intended scope of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution and causality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths, weaknesses and implications</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completeness and insight of conclusions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conclusions in the report are highlighted at the end of each section in the findings and appear to serve various ends. While some are worded as succinct statements that more closely resemble “findings” (i.e., specific statements summarizing evidence on a key issue or question); others offer more or less abbreviated summaries or discussions of collated evidence; some are worded as recommendations; a few appear to be lessons; and some are clearly conclusions that underscore problems or priority issues. In all, some 53 conclusions are noted in the report. While relevant to UNICEF and derived from the input of a broad range of stakeholders, the conclusions are too many in number to serve the decision-making needs of senior managers. Some attempt to disaggregate these according to their intended audience/users (e.g., COs, RO, WFP) would have been helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. They 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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Feedback on Section D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. Up to two sentences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings are relevant to the selected evaluation criteria, are drawn from a broad sources of evidence, and are supported by stakeholder validation processes. However, the extent to which the findings answer the full breadth of related evaluation questions is unclear. Conclusions, on the other hand, are clearly derived from the proposed set of findings, but their relevance and intended use could be clarified further.
SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</th>
<th>Usefulness of recommendations</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report, and findings relevant to each of the recommendations are clearly cited in the supporting text. As part of the overall approach used to ensure that recommendations directly support operational decision-making processes within UNICEF (p.14), preliminary recommendations were shared with group of key stakeholders at WCARO and ranked by participants according to their importance, urgency, and feasibility. In all, seven recommendations are provided, reflecting a mix of both strategic (e.g., planning) and operational level concerns (e.g., delivery of response) that directly address the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. | The Annex 1 in the report provides a detailed matrix supporting text. As part of the overall approach it provides clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the findings and they are relevant to the purpose of this assessment. The section successfully included a recommendations matrix that is both practical and useful, given the detail it covers. | If Lessons Learned are N/A, then this section will be rated as "Best Practice". The recommendations are directly linked to the findings and they are relevant to the purpose of this assessment. The section successfully included a recommendations matrix that is both practical and useful, given the detail it covers. |
| 44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object | Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object.                                               | The recommendations are clearly stated and prioritised. Recommendations are prioritized in terms of their relevance and importance to stakeholders (which they themselves validated, ranked and organized according to their urgency and feasibility). | Lessons learned should be provided or disaggregated from the lists of conclusions provided for each dimension. |
| 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 prioritized. 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. | Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report, and findings relevant to each of the recommendations are clearly cited in the supporting text. As part of the overall approach used to ensure that recommendations directly support operational decision-making processes within UNICEF (p.14), preliminary recommendations were shared with group of key stakeholders at WCARO and ranked by participants according to their importance, urgency, and feasibility. In all, seven recommendations are provided, reflecting a mix of both strategic (e.g., planning) and operational level concerns (e.g., delivery of response) that directly address the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. | The Annex 1 in the report provides a detailed matrix supporting text. As part of the overall approach it provides clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the findings and they are relevant to the purpose of this assessment. The section successfully included a recommendations matrix that is both practical and useful, given the detail it covers. | If Lessons Learned are N/A, then this section will be rated as "Best Practice". The recommendations are directly linked to the findings and they are relevant to the purpose of this assessment. The section successfully included a recommendations matrix that is both practical and useful, given the detail it covers. |
| 46 Are 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. | 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. | The recommendations are clearly stated and prioritised. Recommendations are prioritized in terms of their relevance and importance to stakeholders (which they themselves validated, ranked and organized according to their urgency and feasibility). | Lessons learned should be provided or disaggregated from the lists of conclusions provided for each dimension. |
| 47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: an understanding of the commissioning organisation, awareness of the implementation constraints and an understanding of the follow-up processes. | 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. | The recommendations are clearly stated and prioritised. Recommendations are prioritized in terms of their relevance and importance to stakeholders (which they themselves validated, ranked and organized according to their urgency and feasibility). | Lessons learned should be provided or disaggregated from the lists of conclusions provided for each dimension. |
| 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. | 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. | The recommendations are clearly stated and prioritised. Recommendations are prioritized in terms of their relevance and importance to stakeholders (which they themselves validated, ranked and organized according to their urgency and feasibility). | Lessons learned should be provided or disaggregated from the lists of conclusions provided for each dimension. |
| 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. | 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. | The recommendations are clearly stated and prioritised. Recommendations are prioritized in terms of their relevance and importance to stakeholders (which they themselves validated, ranked and organized according to their urgency and feasibility). | Lessons learned should be provided or disaggregated from the lists of conclusions provided for each dimension. |
| 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. | 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. | The recommendations are clearly stated and prioritised. Recommendations are prioritized in terms of their relevance and importance to stakeholders (which they themselves validated, ranked and organized according to their urgency and feasibility). | Lessons learned should be provided or disaggregated from the lists of conclusions provided for each dimension. |
The assessment provides a detailed recommendations matrix that is practical and useful to UNICEF, as they include details on the specific actors that should be implementing the recommended actions, the timing, the feasibility, and the issues that need to be taken in consideration. There are no lessons learned in this report, but it may be because it is not required by the TORs or that they were included in the reports for specific COs.
### SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style and presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The presentation is clear and concise. With the exception of the time frame (mentioned on page 14) and list of tables found in the report, all of the main elements are cited in the opening pages of the document. The report follows an internally coherent structure, wherein findings are followed by conclusions that summarize emerging issues. Clearer differentiation of the conclusions, including possible indications of key finding statements would help guide the reader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Is the report logically structured?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The annexes do not have all of the required information, as it is missing the data collection tools (i.e. interview protocols), an evaluation matrix, and information about the evaluators. The annex on the recommendations in particular is practical and useful for UNICEF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Overall, the report is coherent and logically structured, facilitating the understanding of the object of the evaluation, as well as its main findings and recommendations. There are only a couple of minor elements that are not included in the opening pages and the annexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The timeframe of the evaluation should be clearly stated in the opening pages of the report, and a list of tables and figures should also supplement the table of contents. Annexes should include data collection instruments, workplan and an evaluation matrix that links evaluation criteria, questions and methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Executive Summary

The executive summary contains all the required elements, and it can stand alone to inform decision makers. It provides an overview of the main findings and detailed summaries of the recommendations. There are only a couple of minor elements that are not included in the opening pages and the annexes.

### Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Can the executive summary stand alone?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Can the executive summary inform decision making?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Executive Feedback on Section F

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

- **Remarks**: The independent assessment is logically structured and the executive summary stands alone. There are only minor elements that were not included in the opening pages and annexes.
### Overview of the Evaluation

The report reflects an excellent understanding of UNICEF and its mechanisms and support systems in Humanitarian interventions.

#### Executive Feedback on Overall Rating

The recommendations become an essential part of this formative exercise and therefore the evaluation was rated Outstanding/Best Practice given the quality and details provided. The main areas for improvement would be in the methodology, where the evaluation should have explained the methods used to assess human rights, gender, and equity aspects, and in the conclusions to each of the findings, by clarifying their intended use.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>OVERALL RATING</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?</td>
<td>The data collection methods of the RTIA are robust enough to give confidence in the findings. A wide range of perspectives were integrated and measures were taken to mitigate risks/limitations. The findings are adequate and reflect the collective voice of those being interviewed, which in turn informed the evaluators to formulate conclusions and recommendations.</td>
<td>The strongest area in this evaluation is the quality of the recommendations, as they clearly identify actions needed, timeframe, responsible unit, feasibility, and any other special considerations. Given that the purpose of this evaluation was to &quot;facilitate learning and program improvements while the response remained ongoing&quot; (p.6), the recommendations are the most important and useful elements of the evaluation. Therefore priority was given to the quality of the recommendations and it is the main reason why this evaluation was given a &quot;Best Practice Rating&quot;. Additionally, the purpose, objectives, and scope are clear and the description of the context and background of the intervention enables the audience to understand the findings in the report. Moreover, the methods used in this assessment were described with great detail and provided evidence of the degree of participation of stakeholders in the evaluation. The findings reflect the quality of the methodology and provide clear evidence for the conclusions made. Some areas of improvement include to provide reasoning for using and incorporating additional evaluation criteria, as well as describing the methods used to assess Human rights based approaches, gender and equity aspects. Clarification of the conclusions would be useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</td>
<td>The six sections are logically structured and are linked throughout. For example, the recommendations listed out the findings from which the recommendations were formulated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</td>
<td>The new selection of evaluation criteria was decided during the inception phase, and no reasoning is provided for the additional criteria. This could have been mentioned in the inception report and therefore not much weight was given to the evaluation framework quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**OVERALL RATING**

Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: D/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?

**Remarks**

This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.

---

**iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation**

In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise

---

**Executive Feedback on Overall Rating**

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