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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
Lessons for future evaluations: This report is exceptionally well written and is based on a strong evaluation methodology. The evaluation and the final report are in close accordance with UNICEF GEROS standards and there is very limited room for improvement. However, the report could be strengthened by further clarifying the evaluation scope by stating whether any programme elements lie outside of the evaluations scope. Additionally, it is best to validate recommendations with stakeholders prior to issuing the final report so that any changes requested by the stakeholders can be included in the final report version.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Highly Satisfactory

The report provides an exceptionally detailed description of the national context, including characteristics of the government at various operating levels (i.e. municipal, national, etc.) and civil society. The unique needs of different groups of children (i.e. rural, urban, different economic status, with or without parental guidance, etc.) are very well outlined and provide excellent insight into issues related to equity and gender equality. The country programme is equally well described and includes a summary of the programme's planned outcomes and outputs. These were used by the consultant to re-create the programme's Theory of Change, which is also presented. The programme budget is clearly indicated near the beginning of the report, which helps indicate the extent to which UNICEF has invested in Moldova. Stakeholders are clearly identified using bullet points and their contributions to the programme are explicitly discussed.

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

Satisfactory

The evaluation purpose and its specific objectives are clearly outlined. The report explains why this evaluation is needed at this point in time, how the information will be used, and who will use the results. While the scope in terms of what is included in the evaluation is well outlined, the report does not mention whether any programming elements lie outside of the evaluation scope.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation used a mixed methods theory-based approach and the report does an excellent job at describing why this approach was appropriate for the evaluation purpose. The report is particularly strong at providing justifications for why methodological choices were made (including why the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria were appropriate for this evaluation; why certain data collection tools were used; etc.). Evaluation limitations and mitigation strategies are nicely presented within a dedicated table. The ethical obligations of the evaluators and the ethical safeguards used to protect participants (including adolescents) are very well described.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The findings are well written and are structured around the evaluation criteria and questions. Findings concerning programme effectiveness reference the programme's results framework and include a discussion around unexpected effects. The analysis is very strong in that it clearly identifies the programme's strengths and areas for improvement as well as the causal factors behind the achievement and non-achievement of results. The programme's M&E system is well assessed (including how information is used for decision-making) and suggestions for improvements are outlined in the recommendations section.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The conclusions are pitched at the correct level and present the most important key messages that emerged from the findings. They discuss both strengths and areas for improvement and are future-oriented. Lessons learned are correctly formulated and contribute interesting programming insights that can be applied to similar programmes in other contexts.

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

Satisfactory

Recommendations are very well written and include excellent detailed guidance around how to implement them. They are prioritized and the target audience is clearly identified for each recommendation. They are derived from the findings and conclusions and even specify which findings they are drawn from. The report describes the process involved in developing them and in validating them with UNICEF stakeholders. However, the report explains that the process to validate the recommendations will occur after approving the final report. It would likely have been more useful to UNICEF had the recommendations been validated by stakeholders prior to issuing the final report so that the final version reflects any desired changes.

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

Highly Satisfactory

The evaluation report is logically structured in the standard format with one section nicely leading to the next. The opening pages contain all of the required elements including the report date, the evaluation location, the evaluation timeframe, the name of the commissioning agency, and information about the evaluation team. The annexes are complete and add significant credibility to the report. They include an evaluation matrix, the ToRs, additional information about the methodology, copies of the methodological tools, and lists of data sources and people interviewed, among others.

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

Highly Satisfactory
The evaluation thoroughly incorporated human rights, equity, and gender equality principles and considerations. Specific evaluation questions were designed to capture these elements, which included questions relating to the extent to which the CO took these elements into consideration during the design of the programme as well as the extent to which they were respected during the implementation of the programme. An HR, equity, and GEEW analysis is found throughout all sections of the report, including the background section, the methodology section, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Sensitive HRBA, equity, and GEEW language is used throughout the report and the evaluation is framed around these principles.

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

**Highly Satisfactory**

The Executive Summary is very well written. It presents a thorough and concise overview of the main elements of the evaluation and is a good length to inform decision-makers (6 pages). The findings, recommendations, and lessons learned are particularly well presented with an adequate level of detail, making it so that the reader does not need to refer to the body of the report to understand the main messages.

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Exceeds requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations for improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A</th>
<th>This is a strong section. No further improvement is required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section B</td>
<td>It is useful to explicitly mention whether any programming elements lie outside of the evaluation scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C</td>
<td>This is a strong section. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section D</td>
<td>Findings are strong. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section E</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section F</td>
<td>It is best to validate recommendations prior to issuing the final report so that any changes requested by the stakeholders can be included in the final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section G</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section H</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I</td>
<td>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>