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

#### Colour Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Good/Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Almost Satisfactory/Almost Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Not Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Very Confident to Act</td>
<td>Outstanding/Very Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Satisfactory</td>
<td>Almost Confident to Act</td>
<td>Almost Satisfactory/April Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not Confident to Act</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory/Not Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF’S Response to Georgia Crisis: Real Time Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sequence number</td>
<td>Date of Review</td>
<td>Year of the Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-800</td>
<td>21/12/10</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO</td>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>TORs Present</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOD PARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2.1 UNICEF managed. Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</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 ongoing response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP Correspondence</td>
<td>5.3 Cross-cutting: Addresses issues that are named as cross-cutting strategies of the MTSP or otherwise known to operate within all MTSP areas. Includes but is not limited to the human rights-based approach to programming, gender equality, knowledge management, evaluation, &amp; communication for development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Independence</td>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing/Stage</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF’S Response to Georgia Crisis: Real Time Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sequence number</td>
<td>Date of Review</td>
<td>Year of the Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-800</td>
<td>21/12/10</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO</td>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>TORs Present</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOD PARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2.1 UNICEF managed. Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</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 ongoing response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP Correspondence</td>
<td>5.3 Cross-cutting: Addresses issues that are named as cross-cutting strategies of the MTSP or otherwise known to operate within all MTSP areas. Includes but is not limited to the human rights-based approach to programming, gender equality, knowledge management, evaluation, &amp; communication for development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Independence</td>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing/Stage</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF’S Response to Georgia Crisis: Real Time Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sequence number</td>
<td>Date of Review</td>
<td>Year of the Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-800</td>
<td>21/12/10</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO</td>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>TORs Present</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOD PARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2.1 UNICEF managed. Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</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 ongoing response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP Correspondence</td>
<td>5.3 Cross-cutting: Addresses issues that are named as cross-cutting strategies of the MTSP or otherwise known to operate within all MTSP areas. Includes but is not limited to the human rights-based approach to programming, gender equality, knowledge management, evaluation, &amp; communication for development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Independence</td>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing/Stage</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF’S Response to Georgia Crisis: Real Time Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sequence number</td>
<td>Date of Review</td>
<td>Year of the Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-800</td>
<td>21/12/10</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO</td>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>TORs Present</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOD PARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2.1 UNICEF managed. Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</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 ongoing response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP Correspondence</td>
<td>5.3 Cross-cutting: Addresses issues that are named as cross-cutting strategies of the MTSP or otherwise known to operate within all MTSP areas. Includes but is not limited to the human rights-based approach to programming, gender equality, knowledge management, evaluation, &amp; communication for development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Independence</td>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing/Stage</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</th>
<th>UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF’S Response to Georgia Crisis: Real Time Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sequence number</td>
<td>Date of Review</td>
<td>Year of the Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-800</td>
<td>21/12/10</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central &amp; Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO</td>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>TORs Present</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOD PARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Evaluation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2.1 UNICEF managed. Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</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 ongoing response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP Correspondence</td>
<td>5.3 Cross-cutting: Addresses issues that are named as cross-cutting strategies of the MTSP or otherwise known to operate within all MTSP areas. Includes but is not limited to the human rights-based approach to programming, gender equality, knowledge management, evaluation, &amp; communication for development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Independence</td>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing/Stage</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Almost Yes</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>The object of the evaluation is UNICEF’s response to the emergency of which details are provided. The report lays out the issues and difficulties that the response faced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>As a real time evaluation of a crisis (invasion of a country) the results chain/logic model might not be an appropriate tool. However I think it is important that Unicef itself should perhaps have in place a framework that would enable scenario testing for this type of crisis situation. This would enable Unicef to understand whether it is able to respond in an effective fashion. This type of strategic framework would enable then the 'real time evaluation' to use this type of framework as a comparator. By doing this it would be possible to assess whether the response to a particular crisis was below/average/above average. In this case it is clear that a strategic framework was not in place and that the level of 'scenario planning' in the office was limited. The report indicates that the focus of the country office was on development activities and whilst it had access to both Abkhazia and South Ossetia detailed planning for the type of crisis seems to have been lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>This evaluation was carried out in real time and when the conflict, and the response, were being scaled down. This presented limitations on what the evaluation could undertake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>There isn’t a specific section detailing the stakeholders involved but it is clear that there were a number of other players including local NGOs. A simple table of the stakeholder groups and their inputs would have been helpful. UNICEF did not act alone even though it played an important role in relation to WASH and child centred needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Are UNICEF contributions described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>This was an emergency 'real time evaluation' rather than a project evaluation of UNICEF’s response. The report lays out the issues and difficulties that the response faced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Are UNICEF contributions described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed. Contextual information does enhance understanding of the findings. The crisis situation has now subsided and the discussion within the report makes clear how the situation could be better dealt with in future emergencies of this nature.

Executive Feedback on Section A

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

Up to two sentences

This was an emergency 'real time evaluation' rather than a project evaluation of UNICEF's response. The report lays out the issues and difficulties that the response faced. One of the things missing is a table of the stakeholders involved to highlight the range of organisations and their roles and responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The evaluation report makes clear use of the OECD/DAC Criteria for Humanitarian Evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Report is clear about the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and how it would be carried out even though this was a difficult situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Note that this is clearly a humanitarian intervention it could have been taken for granted that these were appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No explanation is provided, however, given that this is a humanitarian intervention it could have been taken for granted that these were appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Did the evaluation design consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF’s commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Noted in the text is meeting the Core Commitments for Children as part of the scope of the evaluation, which are based on right principles. There is no gender perspective. Also noted is a right to information when included in the study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Feedback on Section B

The report is clear about the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Clear use was made of the OECD/DAC Criteria for Humanitarian Evaluations. Mention is made of the Core Commitments for Children, which are based on rights principles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 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 practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection methods are specified and there is sufficient attention to the need to triangulate information in this setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 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 &amp; overcome data limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data sources are specified including key UNICEF material (e.g. SitReps) were used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 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</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical issues are not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 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</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Methodology can certainly be considered as appropriate, although may be relatively optimistic given the situation in which they were being undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 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&amp;E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This was a humanitarian response and therefore no existing M&amp;E system in place. Use of SitReps etc was included in the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights evaluation was not included in this report - as TORs are not available it is hard to know if this was asked for. As the list of people interviewed was not included it is not possible to make any comments on the gender/child focus of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender &amp; child rights) frameworks? UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Do the analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide adequate information on human rights (inc. women &amp; child rights) aspects? The inclusion of human rights and 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Is the methodology appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the scope?</td>
<td>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 &amp; structural causes of the non-realization of rights. Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfill obligations &amp; aspects of social exclusion, disparities &amp; equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</td>
<td>The breadth &amp; 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 &amp; preferable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual?</td>
<td>As a humanitarian intervention the construction of a counterfactual is unlikely to be relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</td>
<td>Methodology can be considered as certainly appropriate with a combination of interviews and documentation review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</td>
<td>Some bias might be seen given the lack of access to all areas involved, but this is acceptable given the risks involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 appropriate although slightly optimistic in the situation in which the evaluation was being undertaken. Without the TORs it is hard to assess if the human rights/gender/child focus is appropriate as it isn’t possible to know what the team were asked to do in detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Constructive feedback for future reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Findings are clearly presented and based on evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported evidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the ‘whole story’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the evidence and avoid bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Do the findings address all of the evaluation’s stated criteria and</td>
<td></td>
<td>The evaluation suffered due to the difficulties of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>situation in which it was carried out. This meant that not all the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The findings should seek to systematically address all of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>initial questions could be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework</td>
<td></td>
<td>answered. There is a progress towards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articulated in the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>results and gaps and limitations in data are discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings are clearly presented and based on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings are well presented and linked to the conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings are well presented and linked to the conclusions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Are unexpected findings discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is limited attention to discussion of unexpected findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these</td>
<td></td>
<td>In terms of cost analysis, an analysis of the transport costs was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</td>
<td></td>
<td>undertaken and recommendations made on this issue. Similarly the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the</td>
<td></td>
<td>question of cash rather than in-kind payments is discussed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answer the following questions: How programme costs compare to other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is one area where the report could have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td>been improved. An effective table showing the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td>key stakeholders and their contribution would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions should take account of the views of a diverse cross-</td>
<td></td>
<td>have been helpful to understanding who was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>section of stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>involved and the role that the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should</td>
<td></td>
<td>various stakeholders played. This could have provided a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation,</td>
<td></td>
<td>basis for contribution of results to identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying</td>
<td></td>
<td>stakeholders or sets of stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as</td>
<td></td>
<td>Causal reasons are included with access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much as possible?</td>
<td></td>
<td>as an important issue as was the slow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the</td>
<td></td>
<td>start to the response due to staff holidays. Procurement issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence and be theoretically robust.</td>
<td></td>
<td>are mentioned to have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal reasons are included with access</td>
<td></td>
<td>slowed down the process as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section D**

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

Up to two sentences

Findings and Conclusions are well presented and linked the conclusions. A stakeholder analysis might have been helpful and would have allowed the wider role of agencies to be included.
### SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? Remarks</th>
<th>Constructive feedback for future reports Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations are grounded in the evidence provided.</td>
<td>Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.</td>
<td>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations are clearly stated and relevant. They are not prioritised, but laid out for the different stakeholders within UNICEF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritisation in terms of key items and the time frame over which they should be implemented would have increased the usefulness of this report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations are laid out by UNICEF stakeholder.</td>
<td>The report presents a number of clear recommendations which are based on the evidence that the evaluation was able to collect and analyze.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The recommendations came from the triangulation process which included interviews and report/data analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Where presented, are lessons learned correctly identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lessons learned are included and correctly identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Where presented, are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lessons learned are laid out for different levels of UNICEF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section E**

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

The recommendations in this report are clearly stated and relevant. They are presented for different levels of UNICEF’s organisation. It would have been helpful if within the different stakeholder groups there had been some prioritization to ensure that stakeholders focused on critical time dependent recommendations first.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?</th>
<th>Constructive feedback for future reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the elements listed in the assessment are not included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, an executive summary is included in the evaluation report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The executive summary can stand alone if for UNICEF purposes it as does contain acronyms which might not be readily understood by those outside UNICEF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the executive summary stand alone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the executive summary inform decision making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the report logically structured?</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a logically structured and clear report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section F**

It is critical that reports are not accepted that are missing key elements including TORs, Annexes, commissioning organisation. If this is not carried out by UNICEF staff then evaluation reports will continue to be incomplete and their integrity threatened even if the work itself was carried out to a high standard in difficult circumstances.
# Real time evaluation - important when ensuring that a response to an emergency is appropriate.

## Question cc Remarks

### I/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?

- **Does not include TORs**
  - TORs not included.
  - 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.

### II/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation

- **Real time evaluation**
  - Important when ensuring that a response to an emergency is appropriate.

### III/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation

- **None**

## OVERALL RATING

### Question

#### 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?

- **A coherent report which would provide sufficient evidence to act on so that various levels within UNICEF can examine their practices to ensure an effective and timely response to any future situation of this nature.**

#### To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?

- A logical report which moves from situation, methodology to conclusions and recommendations. Limitations made clear.

#### Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?

- The undertaking of an evaluation in a conflict situation does create problems which may affect the quality. No TORs included.

## Executive Feedback on Overall Rating

- This report can be used with confidence. The report is coherent and lays out the issues well leading from approach to findings, conclusions and recommendations. Generally well laid out with a set of clear recommendations for the different levels of UNICEF from field through to Global level. The complexity of the response is documented, including the issues of access (not possible to visit all locations) as well as the on-going conflict. The TORs were not included in the report presented which limits the ability to comment on certain issues concerned.