



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

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Almost	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding/ Very Confident to Act	Good/ Confident to Act	Almost satisfactory / Almost Confident to Act	Unsatisfactory / Not Confident to Act	

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

<a href="#">UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</a>
--	--	---

Response	
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Evaluation of the WASH activities undertaken to prevent and control cholera outbreaks in Guinea-Conakry &amp; Guinea-Bissau</b>
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2010/002
<b>Date of Review</b>	26/11/2010
<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2009
<b>Region</b>	West and Central Africa Regional Office
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Guinea-Conakry, Guinea-Bissau
<b>Type of Report</b>	Evaluation
<b>TORs Present</b>	No
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	IOD PARC
Classification of Evaluation Report	
	Comments
<b>Geographical</b> <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation findings)</i>	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.
<b>Management</b> <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.3 Joint managed, with organisations outside the UN system: UNICEF is the co-manager with one or more organizations outside the UN system
<b>Purpose</b> <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'etre)</i>	3.7 Programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives
<b>Result</b> <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>	4.3 Impact: Final results of a programme or policy on the intended beneficiaries and, where possible, on comparison groups. Reflects the cumulative effect of donor supported programmes of cooperation and national policy initiatives.
<b>MTSP Correspondence</b> <i>(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)</i>	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (1. Young child survival & development)
<b>Level of Independence</b> <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.2 Independent internal: The evaluation is implemented by consultants but managed in-house by UNICEF professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies within the division whose work is being evaluated.
<b>Timing / Stage</b>	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</b> This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	The interventions to prevent cholera are described in a clear and concise manner.	<b>A/ Does the report present a clear &amp; full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</b> 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.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>2 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</b> 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.	Yes	The logic of the interventions is explored and analysed in some detail. Understanding the logic of the interventions is central to the evaluation.		
<b>3 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</b> 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	Yes	The contextual description is concise and to the point.		
<b>4 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</b> These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes	The key stakeholders in implementation are identified and their contributions, including those of UNICEF, are described in useful detail.	<b>Confident to Act</b>	The introduction to the activities designed to prevent the spread of cholera are concisely and clearly described. The report includes sufficient detail on stakeholders involved in activities and a clear description of the implementation status.
<b>5 Are key stakeholders' contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Yes			
<b>6 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
<b>7 Is the implementation status described?</b> 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	Yes	The context, development and current implementation status are clearly described.		
<b>8 Does this illuminate findings?</b> The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Yes	The contextual information provided is sufficient to illuminate the findings of the evaluation.		
<b>Executive Feedback on Section A</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The introduction to the activities designed to prevent the spread of cholera are concisely and clearly described. The report includes sufficient detail on stakeholders involved in activities and a clear description of the implementation status.</b>			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE					
Question	cc	Remarks			
<p><b>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</b> This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.</p>	Yes	<p>The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clearly set out and are realistic. The evaluation seeks to identify whether the activities undertaken have had an impact on the understanding of the spread of cholera and have resulted in improvements in the factors that affect the spread of the disease.</p>	<p><b>B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b></p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>	
<p><b>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b> 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</p>	Yes				
<p><b>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</b> 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)</p>	Yes				
<p><b>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</b> It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Outstanding	<p>Whilst the evaluation does not use the OECD/DAC criteria, the report provides a detailed analysis of the appropriate criteria for assessing the objectives of the evaluation.</p>	<p><b>Very Confident to Act</b></p> <p>The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clearly set out and are realistic. The evaluation seeks to identify whether the activities undertaken have had an impact on the understanding of the spread of cholera and have resulted in improvements in the factors that affect the spread of the disease. Whilst the evaluation does not use the OECD/DAC criteria, a systematic literature review is used to identify appropriate criteria for assessing the effectiveness and impact of the interventions.</p>	<p>Both the approach taken to developing the criteria for the evaluation and the clear presentation of the approach could be used as models of best practice.</p>	
<p><b>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</b> The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.</p>	Outstanding				<p>A systematic literature review is used to identify appropriate criteria for assessing the effectiveness and impact of the interventions.</p>
<p><b>14 Did the evaluation design consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming?</b> This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender</p>	No				<p>No mention is made of a human-rights based approach to programming.</p>
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section B</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>The evaluation seeks to identify whether the activities undertaken have had an impact on the understanding of the spread of cholera and have resulted in improvements in the factors that affect the spread of the disease. Whilst the evaluation does not use the OECD/DAC criteria, a systematic literature review is used to identify appropriate criteria for assessing the effectiveness and impact of the interventions.</b></p>				

**SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY**

Question	cc	Remarks		
<p><b>15 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks?</b> This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Outstanding	The report provides both detail on sampling, collection and analysis methods and a clear analysis of the limitations.	<p><b>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>16 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations?</b> 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</p>	Outstanding	The report specifies data sources in some detail and provides a rigorous analysis of their selection and particularly their limitations.		
<p><b>17 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</b> 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</p>	Yes	Whilst ethical issues are not specifically referred to, they underlie the approach taken.		
<p><b>18 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</b> 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</p>	Yes			
<p><b>19 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?</b> 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.</p>	Yes	The limitations of the intervention monitoring system are explored and the lack of a baseline study in particular is discussed. The evaluation includes a detailed exploration of the limitations of the logic model used in the interventions and provides recommendations on how this could be improved.	<p><b>Very Confident to Act</b></p> <p>The report includes a clear and concise introduction to the methodology used, which is a rigorous and robust response to the evaluation objectives. Throughout the report the methodological limitations are explored in considerable detail and at every stage of examining the evidence any limitations are further highlighted. The conclusions drawn take account of these limitations and suggestions are made for further research.</p>	<p>The approach taken to developing the methodology and the careful way in which the evidence is used could be used as models of best practice.</p>
<p><b>20 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;E framework of the evaluated object?</b> 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.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>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?</b> 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.</p>	No	The evaluation is a technical evaluation and does not consider human rights frameworks or provide information on human rights aspects. Human rights issues are not identified in the scope of the evaluation and the methodology is appropriate for addressing the objectives of the evaluation.		

**22 Do the analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide adequate information on human rights (inc. women & 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.

No



<p><b>23 Is the methodology appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the scope?</b> 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 realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations &amp; aspects of social exclusion, disparities &amp; equity.</p>	Yes				
<p><b>24 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?</b> This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	Yes	The levels and activities of stakeholder consultation are described throughout the report and levels of participation are appropriate for the evaluation.			
<p><b>25 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</b> 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.</p>	Yes				
<p><b>26 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual?</b> 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.</p>	Yes	The methodology used includes efforts to collect data for comparative purposes, where this was possible.			
<p><b>27 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</b> The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Outstanding	The methodology provides a rigorous and robust response to the evaluation objectives.			
<p><b>28 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</b> 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</p>	Outstanding	The report explores the methodological limitations in considerable detail and at every stage of examining the evidence. The conclusions drawn take account of these limitations and suggestions are made for further research.			
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section C</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>The report includes a clear and concise introduction to the methodology used, which is a rigorous and robust response to the evaluation objectives. Throughout the report the methodological limitations are explored in considerable detail and at every stage of examining the evidence any limitations are further highlighted, with recommendations of how these could be overcome in the future.</b></p>				

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<p><b>29 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</b> 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.</p>	Outstanding	The findings are presented in a clear, simple and logical manner and at each stage there is a rigorous and objective analysis of the evidence.	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.	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>30 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</b> The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</p>	Outstanding	The findings address the evaluation criteria and questions systematically and in a robust way. The presentation of findings is logical and easy to follow. At every stage gaps and limitations of the data are explored in considerable detail.		
<p><b>31 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</b> There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</p>	Outstanding		Very Confident to Act	The presentation of the conclusions in particular could be used as an example of best practice.
<p><b>32 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</b> 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.</p>	Outstanding			
<p><b>33 Are unexpected findings discussed?</b> If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</p>	Yes	Unexpected findings are highlighted and discussed in some detail. A cost analysis was not included in the evaluation.		
<p><b>34 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</b> 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.</p>	No			
<p><b>35 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</b> For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</p>	Yes	The evaluation explores in some detail the limited contribution to results that specific interventions and stakeholders have made. The conclusions take account of a range of views and make an overall objective assessment.		
<p><b>36 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</b> 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.</p>	Yes			

<p><b>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</b>          These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust.  <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Outstanding	The causal reasons for successes and failures are analysed in a robust manner, taking account of evidence available.		
<p><b>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</b>          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.</p>	Yes	The report gives thorough consideration to the future implications of the technical and capacity constraints.		
<p><b>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</b>          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.</p>	Outstanding	The conclusions are a balanced view of the strengths and weaknesses of the interventions. The conclusions are valuable insights and are a concise summary of the findings.		
<p><b>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</b>          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.</p>	Outstanding			
<p><b>41 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</b>          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).</p>	Outstanding	The conclusions are a model example of both presentation in a clear and accessible way and of valuable insights based on a robust examination of the evidence.		
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section D</b>          Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating.  <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>The findings are presented in a clear, simple and logical manner and at each stage there is a rigorous and objective analysis of the evidence. The conclusions are a model example of both presentation in a clear and accessible way and of valuable insights based on the overall findings.</b></p>			

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</b> Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Outstanding	The recommendations are thoroughly grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported.	Very Confident to Act	<b>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</b> 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.
<b>43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</b> Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Outstanding	The recommendations are a clear and robust response to the purpose of the evaluation. The recommendations are clearly prioritised, simply stated and aimed at improving future effectiveness.		
<b>44 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</b> If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	Outstanding			
<b>45 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</b> Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	Yes	Whilst specific target groups are not identified, the recommendations are set out in a clear enough manner for their target to be obvious. The recommendations are based on a thorough understanding of the local context and of the social, cultural and institutional limitations of future implementation.	Very Confident to Act	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>46 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</b> This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Outstanding			
<b>47 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</b> 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.	Yes	The recommendations come from an examination of the evidence and are appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation.		
<b>48 Where presented, are lessons learned correctly identified?</b> 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.	N/A			
<b>49 Where presented, are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</b> Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	N/A			
<b>Executive Feedback on Section E</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The recommendations are a clear and robust response to the purpose of the evaluation. The recommendations are clearly prioritised, simply stated and aimed at improving future effectiveness.</b>			

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>50. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</b> Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Yes	The opening pages include all of the basic elements.	<b>Very Confident to Act</b> The report is clearly and logically structured, with helpful summaries throughout. The executive summary, in particular, is an excellent example of how such a report should be summarised.	The executive summary should be used as an example of best practice for all evaluations.
<b>51. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</b> If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A	Yes	Executive summary is included.		
<b>52 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</b> Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	Yes	The executive summary, at two pages long, is an excellent example of how such a report should be summarised. The executive summary is a concise summary of all of the key elements of the report and could inform decision making.		
<b>53 Can the executive summary stand alone?</b> It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Outstanding			
<b>54 Can the executive summary inform decision making?</b> It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Outstanding			
<b>55 Is the report logically structured?</b> Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Outstanding	The report is clearly and logically structured, with helpful summaries throughout.		
<b>56 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</b> Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Yes	The annexes are brief but include the information that adds value to the report.		
<b>57 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b>	Yes			
<b>58 Is the style of the report human rights compliant?</b> This 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	No	The evaluation makes no mention of human rights.		
<b>Executive Feedback on Section F</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>		<b>The report is clearly and logically structured, with summaries throughout. The executive summary, in particular, is an excellent example of how such a report should be summarised.</b>		

Additional Information			
Question	Remarks		
<b>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</b> If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	The Terms of Reference are not included and should have been. The evaluation does, however, successfully address the objectives set out in the report.		
<b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation	The use of a systematic literature review to identify criteria for the assessment and the analysis and presentation of the findings and the presentation and prioritization of the recommendations are aspects of best practice in the evaluation.		
<b>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	The evaluation highlights the use of door to door visits to spread messages about cholera prevention as an intervention for further exploration.		
OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
<b>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act?</b> 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?	Outstanding	The approach taken is methodologically appropriate, the evidence is sufficient robust and authoritative and the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations are thorough and highly credible.	Very Confident to Act
<b>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</b> The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Outstanding	The report holds together in a consistent and logical whole.	
<b>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</b> This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.			
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The report is an outstanding example of a thorough and robust evaluation that responds to and exceeds the objectives of identifying whether the activities undertaken have had an impact on the understanding of the spread of cholera and have resulted in improvements in the factors that affect the spread of the disease. The approach taken to collecting and analysing the evidence and the presentation of the findings are examples of the best practice in evaluation, resulting in conclusions and recommendations that are both thorough and highly credible.</b>		