

# Executive Feedback

<b>Title of the evaluation</b>	<b>Evaluation of Supply Division's Supply Community Strategy</b>
<b>Sequence No</b>	2017/001
<b>Region</b>	HQ
<b>Office</b>	Supply Division
<b>Coverage</b>	HQ/Global
<b>Evaluation Type</b>	Strategy
<b>Year of Report</b>	2017

**OVERALL RATING**

• • - - **Fair**

**Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may continue to use the evaluation with caution, but substantive**

**Implications:** improvements are possible.

The evaluation uses a strong mixed methods methodology and presents solid and useful findings. However, a more explicit description of the evaluation purpose (including who will use the evaluation and to what end) needs to be provided as well as a justification for methodological choices, including a sampling strategy to justify which stakeholders were selected for interviews. The report should also justify why the standard criterion of "sustainability" was not included among the evaluation criteria. Additionally, the report should discuss the ethical obligations of the evaluation team, preferably providing a link to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines. Unexpected findings should be more clearly identified and discussed as well as the implications of the conclusions for future programming (especially considering that this is a formative evaluation). The report does not satisfactorily integrate and mainstream human rights, equity, and gender equality considerations. To do this, the evaluation matrix should include specific questions related to how well the strategy is addressing the different needs of women and men and sub-groups. Additionally, the different experiences of women and men should be discussed throughout the evaluation report, drawing on sex-disaggregated data. Although the Executive Summary is a good length, it needs to include information on the evaluation itself (including purpose, objectives, and methodology) along with conclusions and lessons learned. The Executive Summary should be a synthesized version of the report and should reflect the primary report sections. Finally, the report's annexes could be strengthened by including a list of documents consulted, information on the sampling strategy used to select interview

**Lessons for future evaluations:** respondents, and information about the evaluators.

**SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)**

• • • - **Satisfactory**

The report provides a good description of the UNICEF SD, the development of the supply community, and the major pillars of the supply strategy. Information around the practicalities of how the strategy is expected to lead to change (including a description of the interventions) and stakeholder involvement is provided in the annexes (although the report should direct the reader towards this information). The changing strategic function of the SD is well outlined within the UNICEF context. However, a more detailed description of the diverse SD staff and their needs would be useful.

**SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)**

• • - - **Fair**

The report explains how the purpose of the evaluation is to "document the strategy's achievements and to provide guidance for its amelioration in the years ahead". It would be useful if the report could be more specific about how the findings and recommendations of the evaluation will be used and by whom. Four (4) clear evaluation objectives are presented and appear to be feasible, although quite ambitious. The document does not reference the evaluation scope but it can be assumed that the evaluation covers the entire strategy from its inception.

---

#### SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

• • - -

##### **Fair**

The evaluation uses a strong mixed methods approach, which includes desk research, a global survey, interviews with staff from different functions/field offices, interviews with comparable international organizations, and participatory workshops with Supply staff. However, the reasons for using this specific approach and data collection tools are not provided. A list of stakeholders interviewed is presented in the annexes but there is no discussion around the sampling strategy used to identify these particular people. The evaluation uses standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria but does not explain why the standard criterion of "sustainability" is not included. Ethical considerations regarding ethical safeguards for participants are briefly mentioned but nothing is said about the ethical obligations of the evaluators.

---

#### SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

• • • -

##### **Satisfactory**

Findings reference both qualitative and quantitative data and are particularly strong at identifying causal reasons for the accomplishment or non-accomplishment of results. Even though the strategy did not include a results framework, findings still discussed the extent to which outputs have contributed to outcome and impact-level results (although this assessment could have been done more explicitly). While some unexpected effects are discussed within the findings, they are not explicitly identified or labelled as such. Even though the strategy did not contain an M&E system, the report provides a suggested future M&E framework within the annexes. However, it does not discuss how monitoring data should be used to inform decision making.

---

#### SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)

• • • -

##### **Satisfactory**

Conclusions are structured around the evaluation criteria and discuss both strengths and areas for improvement. However, the report does not provide an in-depth discussion around the implications of the findings and the future of the strategy. Lessons learned from other similar initiatives are presented as a learning tool. They are correctly formulated and provide interesting insights that are relevant to the object of evaluation.

---

#### SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

• • • -

##### **Satisfactory**

Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions and will likely be useful to the primary intended users. All of the recommendations are clearly targeted to the SD. While the recommendations are numbered, the report does not explicitly state that they are presented in order of priority. The report also does not explain the process followed for developing the recommendations, including the level of stakeholder participation in this process.

---

#### SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

• • • -

##### **Satisfactory**

The report is well written and logically structured with one section logically preceding the next. The opening pages contain all of the necessary information and the annexes include the ToRs, an evaluation matrix, additional information on the program description and stakeholder involvement, a reconstructed theory of change model, a proposed M&E framework, and copies of the data collection tools. The annexes could be strengthened by also including a list of documents consulted, information on the sampling strategy used to select interview respondents, and information about the evaluators.

#### SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)



##### Unsatisfactory

The evaluation does not sufficiently integrate and mainstream GEEW, equity, and human-rights considerations. Human rights are not at all referenced and issues of equity are only at times discussed in the evaluation findings. The global survey asks respondents to specify their sex, making it possible to create sex-disaggregated data. However, differences in responses between men and women are only referenced once in the report. The evaluation matrix does not include any specific questions that would facilitate the gathering of information and analysis of gender and equity-specific issues. The report indicates that a reference group guided the evaluation but the level of stakeholder participation throughout the evaluation process is not at all discussed.

#### SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)



##### Fair

The Executive Summary is a good length (6 pages) but does not include all of the necessary elements. The Executive Summary should include more information on the object of evaluation and some information on the operating context. Information on the evaluation itself (including purpose, objectives, and methodology) should also be provided. Although the Executive Summary presents findings and recommendations, it is also necessary to present conclusions and lessons learned.

#### Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

3

Missing requirements

#### Recommendations for improvement

##### Section A

The report could include a sentence to direct the reader to the annexes to find information on the program interventions and stakeholders. Also, a more detailed description of the diversity of the SD staff and their needs would be useful.

##### Section B

It would be useful if the report could be more specific about how the findings and recommendations of the evaluation will be used and by whom. The report should take the time to explicitly identify the evaluation scope and to mention whether any changes have been made to the original ToRs.

##### Section C

The report could be strengthened by providing an explanation as to why a mixed methods approach was used and was appropriate for achieving the objectives of the evaluation. Also, the sampling strategy used to identify stakeholders interviewed should be presented and the report should explain why the standard criterion of "sustainability" was not applied to this evaluation. The report needs a more extensive section on ethics and needs to explain how evaluators followed ethical standards. It is useful to provide a link to the OECD/DAC ethical standards.

##### Section D

The report's assessment of outcome and impact-level change would have been stronger if the evaluation had structured findings around the reconstructed theory of change model. It helps the reader identify unexpected effects if they are included within their own separate and clearly labelled sub-section. Additionally, the proposed M&E strategy would be even stronger if the report mentioned how monitoring data should be used to inform decision making.

##### Section E

Considering that this is a formative evaluation, the report should provide detailed information on the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future implementation of the strategy.

---

Section F	It is important for the report to explain the process followed in developing recommendations as well as the level of stakeholder participation in this process in order to help the reader understand the extent to which the recommendations have been validated by stakeholders. Additionally, the report should include a sentence specifying that recommendations are presented in priority order (if this is, in fact, the case).
Section G	The annexes could be strengthened by also including a list of documents consulted, information on the sampling strategy used to select interview respondents, and information about the evaluators.
Section H	The evaluation should reference the rights of the people intended to benefit from the strategy and should mainstream equity and GEEW considerations throughout the evaluation process and report. This can be done by including specific questions in the evaluation matrix related to how well the strategy is addressing the different needs of women and men and sub-groups. Additionally, the different experiences of women and men should be discussed throughout the evaluation report, drawing on sex-disaggregated data. The report should also explain how stakeholders were involved in the managing and implementing the evaluation, including whether they were consulted during the formulation of the evaluation recommendations.
Section I	The Executive Summary should include more information on the object of evaluation and some information on the operating context. Information on the evaluation itself (including purpose, objectives, and methodology) should also be provided, along with conclusions and lessons learned. The Executive Summary should be a synthesized version of the report and should reflect the primary report sections.

---