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Evaluation Type: Programme
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OVERALL RATING

Highly Satisfactory

Implications:
Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence.

This is a strong evaluation that is based on a good qualitative methodology and that presents well formulated and insightful findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. Even so, there remain some areas for improvement. First of all, it is a good idea to mention the total cost of the programme and UNICEF’s financial contributions towards it near the beginning of the report in order to understand the relative importance of the programme to UNICEF. The evaluation could be more sensitive to equity considerations if it were to further break down groups of rights holders (i.e. the Roma population) into sub-groups whenever possible to identify whether any sub-groups of programme beneficiaries have any unique perspectives and needs that should be taken into consideration. When describing the object of evaluation it is good practice to also include a results framework with specific results targets. If one does not exist, then this should be mentioned within the report. Although the report is well written, the writing could be further strengthened by carefully reviewing the report to ensure that all of the necessary grammar articles such as "a" and "the" are included. Regarding the Executive Summary, it is useful to provide a thorough yet synthesized description of the object of evaluation within it so that the reader does not need to refer to the body of the report to understand the intervention and how it was implemented. Finally, the evaluation could be more sensitive to gender equality considerations by ensuring that a specific gender equality focused evaluation question is integrated into the evaluation matrix and that gender equality considerations are mainstreamed into the other evaluation questions as much as possible.

Lessons for future evaluations:

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
The report provides a good description of the object of evaluation and the context in which it operates (including a description of the national healthcare system and the needs of the Roma population). However, the program description could be strengthened by mentioning the total cost of the programme as well as UNICEF's financial contributions towards it. The background section could be strengthened by identifying any different needs that sub-groups of marginalized Roma may be facing. It is important to try to disaggregate the programme beneficiaries (i.e. the Roma) as much as possible in order to identify differences between sub-groups of rights holders in terms of their past experiences, current situations, and needs. While the report presents a good reconstructed Theory of Change, a results framework with specific results targets is not presented. It should be mentioned if one does not exist.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The evaluation purpose is clearly presented, including why it was commissioned at this point in time and how the evaluation findings and recommendations will be used and by whom. Evaluation objectives are also clearly presented and relate to the evaluation purpose. The evaluation scope is clearly identified in terms of geographic and chronological coverage.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory

The evaluation is based on a robust qualitative methodology and the data collection methods are well described and their selection is justified. The report explains how both triangulation and a "robustness scoring" technique were used to assess the data and create the evaluation findings. Evaluation limitations as well as mitigation strategies (through the use of the designed methodology) are clearly presented. The report references the UNEG Ethical Standards and discusses how the behaviour of the evaluators was in line with these standards and how the evaluators implemented ethical safeguards to protect evaluation participants.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Highly Satisfactory

Findings are clearly presented (using bold font), are structured around the evaluation criteria and questions, and are supported by sufficient levels of evidence. Findings on effectiveness are structured around the programme results presented in its Strategic Framework. The findings are strong at describing the causal reasons for the accomplishment and non-accomplishment of results. The report is very strong at assessing the programme's M&E system, including how information is used for decision-making, as one of the evaluation objectives is to assess the M&E system. Unexpected results are also clearly identified and discussed, as there is a specific evaluation question focused on unexpected findings.

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)
The report presents six conclusions that are based on the findings and that highlight the programme's primary strengths and areas for improvement. The conclusions are analytical and highlight high-level considerations for decision-makers. Two well formulated lessons learned are also presented that can be generalized to RHM programmes in other contexts.

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

The report specifies that recommendations were developed in consultation with programme stakeholders. The recommendations are presented in priority order and clearly identify the target group for action. They appear to be realistic for the programme context and provide a good level of detail in terms of how to implement them.

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

The report is well structured with one section logically leading to the next. The report sections are presented in the standard order and they make excellent use of headings and sub-headings. The opening pages contain all of the necessary basic information, which is very clearly presented. The annexes are complete and provide additional credibility to the report. They include the ToRs, an evaluation matrix, lists of documents consulted and stakeholders interviewed, data collection tools, and information on the evaluation team. Although the report is well written, articles such as "a" and "the" are often missing.

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

The evaluation is based on a strong human rights framework and uses human rights language throughout the report. Issues around equity are also discussed and one evaluation question is designed specifically to collect information on the extent to which the programme has reduced equity gaps. However, the evaluation could be strengthened by further disaggregating data on the Roma population in order to better understand equity differences between Roma. Data is regularly disaggregated by sex. However, there are no evaluation questions designed to specifically gather information relating to gender equality. This causes the report to poorly mainstream gender equality considerations throughout the findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations.

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

Satisfactory
The Executive Summary is well written, provides concise and accessible information, and is a good length (7 pages) to inform decision makers. It provides an excellent summary of the primary evaluation report elements including lessons learned and best practices. However, it would have been useful to provide a slightly more in-depth description of the object of evaluation and its implementation modalities so that the reader does not need to refer to the body of the report to understand the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Approaches requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations for improvement**

**Section A**
It is a good idea to mention the total cost of the programme and UNICEF’s financial contributions towards it near the beginning of the report in order to understand the relative importance of the programme to UNICEF. Additionally, evaluations that are particularly sensitive to issues of equity attempt to break down groups of rights holders (i.e. the Roma population) into sub-groups whenever possible to identify whether any sub-groups of programme beneficiaries have any unique perspectives and needs that should be taken into consideration. Finally, when describing the object of evaluation it is good practice to also include a results framework with specific results targets. If one does not exist, then this should be mentioned within the report.

**Section B**
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

**Section C**
This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.

**Section D**
This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.

**Section E**
This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.

**Section F**
This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.

**Section G**
Although the report is well written, the writing could be further strengthened by carefully reviewing the report to ensure that all of the necessary grammar articles such as "a" and "the" are included.

**Section H**
The evaluation could be strengthened by further disaggregating data on the Roma population in order to better understand equity differences between Roma. These differences are important to identify since sub-groups of marginalized rights holders may have differing needs and priorities. Additionally, women, men, girls, and boys may also have differing needs and it is important for the evaluation to look into how the programme affects gender equality. The best way to ensure that gender equality considerations are addressed is to create a specific gender equality focused evaluation question and to integrate gender equality into the other evaluation questions as much as possible.

**Section I**
It is useful to provide a thorough yet synthesized description of the object of evaluation within the Executive Summary so that the reader does not need to refer to the body of the report to understand the intervention and how it was implemented.