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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour Coding</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>Dark Green</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section &amp; Overall Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Confident to Act</td>
<td>Confident to Act</td>
<td>Almost Confident to Act</td>
<td>Not Confident to Act</td>
<td></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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title of the Evaluation Report</strong></th>
<th><strong>Break the Chain Campaign Namibia 2009 - 2011 Volume 1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report sequence number</strong></td>
<td><strong>2011 - 007</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Review</strong></td>
<td><strong>25/06/2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of the Evaluation Report</strong></td>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country(ies)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Namibia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Report</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of reviewer</strong></td>
<td><strong>IOD PARC</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classification of Evaluation Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Geographical (Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation findings)</strong></th>
<th><strong>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.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5 Not clear from Report</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong> (Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</td>
<td><strong>3.2 At scale: The evaluation examines the efficacy of a programme that is being implemented at or near its maximum intended extent, with the intention of providing feedback on efficiency and the overall effectiveness of the programme at scale.</strong> It is not clear whether the findings of this review are relevant across Namibia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong> (Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</td>
<td><strong>4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTSP Correspondence</strong> (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)</td>
<td><strong>5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (3. HIV/AIDS &amp; children)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Independence</strong> (Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</td>
<td><strong>5.3 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. Management relationships not stated. No role or inputs from UNICEF are identified</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing / Stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>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</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response**

**UNREG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System**

**UNREG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System**

**UNICEF Adapted UNREG Evaluation Report Standards**

**Comments**

The project appears to be nationwide, but the fieldwork for the evaluation is based in 3 project sites. No information is available about the extent to which the project sites are representative of the country as a whole. No information on management roles and responsibilities is provided. It is not clear whether the findings of this review are relevant across Namibia.
## SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object and context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an interview-based research evaluation of a media campaign to interrupt behaviours likely to increase HIV/AIDS prevalence. It has an internal logic, but further analysis is required in order to provide a robust explanation of the choices informants make with regard to their sexual partner/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 &amp; priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Does this illuminate findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The context relates to the project outcomes but no wider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory of Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>“Break the chain” is a project comprising media and advocacy activities seeking to change sexual behaviours. So the evaluation interrogates the demographic cohorts to identify the extent to which attitudes and behaviours change and whether attribution is possible. This is the classic dilemma for any evaluation of public health programmes. The authors assume that findings can be based on what people say about their sexual behaviours and their negotiations with partner/s. The findings in the report are not sufficiently rooted in wider government strategies or in other factors of daily life, such as economic well-being which may additionally affect choice of sexual partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders and their contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to the primary respondents other stakeholders are mentioned, but their contributions to the study and their impact on processes is not clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Are key stakeholders’ contributions described?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UNICEF is not mentioned anywhere in this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</td>
<td></td>
<td>This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>This evaluation reports on a completed set of activities. But it is not clear whether the programme is to continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constructive feedback for future reports

- Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

- Use of other studies need to be better justified and properly referenced.

- A rounded context presenting the considerations which individuals face when making decisions about sexual relations requires researchers to dig into wider factors of social and economic life. It is very difficult to balance the relative importance of a range of influences: culture, finances, emotional attachment, information, hopes and aspiration when trying to attribute causality to human behaviours. The potential of these countervailing influences need to be more actively recognised.

---

**Report should 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.
## SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</strong>&lt;br&gt;This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Almost Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>Evaluation framework</td>
<td>Evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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).</td>
<td>Not Confident to Act</td>
<td>Not Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</strong>&lt;br&gt;It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNICEF 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 (This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</td>
<td>In essence this evaluation is a piece of academic research and the criteria mentioned relate to the selection of the tools and methodologies for focus-group and interview types of investigations. It is silent on the developmental principles which underpin programmes. There is no discussion of rights or of any sets of criteria such as OECD/DAC.</td>
<td>Within its own terms this investigation is coherent and holds together. But only to a superficial extent. There is no justification for this particular approach or proper evaluation of its limitations in this sensitive and very personal area of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section B**<br>Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. Up to two sentences

This evaluation is a piece of academic research which is coherent within its own rather limited terms. Analysis is not rooted in a developmental, policy-relevant framework and so cannot be used with confidence.
## SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> 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 practice.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The strength of the investigation lies in its full description of the sampling methods and the data sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> 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>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> Are ethical issues and considerations described? The Executive Summary states that ethical approval for the study was granted by the GoN. However the report is silent on ethical issues which is particularly noticeable given the sensitivity of the issues under discussion. There is no discussion of safeguards. Were there any personal follow-on costs for taking part in the study, for instance?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong> 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>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results Based Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong> 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>3</td>
<td>Not a Coherent EE Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong> 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>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Rights, Gender and Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong> Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF’s commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity? 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. Style 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.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The methodology upon which this evaluation stands is not sufficient to meet its objectives. It is a set of findings based on focus-group analysis and interviews and that is a familiar research tool which in turn produces a reliable product. But such data sets are not enough to understand the choices individuals make about their sexual behaviours. And here we have a public health issue where changes in behaviour may be affected by factors in addition to those raised in interview. A number of issues frequently follow on from using these sorts of tools. For instance: how confident can we be that respondents are telling the truth either in the survey or when making their decisions in their personal lives? How do individuals balance the relative power of different risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constructive feedback for future reports

*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*

Interview responses often suggest further questions. For instance (1) The ratio of male to female respondents was roughly 1/2 but with the gender imbalance on project findings? (2) On p. 50 around a third of respondents agreed changes in sexual behaviour were taking place, but only 17% in one project site. Why? The study would be stronger had it faced up to these sorts of next order questions.
21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & 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.

22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)?
The inclusion of human rights 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. 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 & structural causes of the non realisation of rights; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations.

23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?
The inclusion of 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. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.

24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?
The inclusion of equity considerations 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. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.

25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?
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.

Stakeholder participation

The main body of the findings appear to be based on discussions with the target populations in the 3 research sites. Other stakeholders - experts or community leaders - are mentioned, but the relative weight given to the views of different categories of respondents is not clear. The criteria for deciding on stakeholder engagement and how that was managed are not set out.
### Methodological robustness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</td>
<td>No, no almost not set out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual?</td>
<td>The study finds that the media project is successful in its own terms. In this sort of exercise a counterfactual might have tried to identify other factors influencing behaviour change. Or are trends in sites not reached by the project going in the same or different directions? It is not always clear what the methodological implications are. For instance how confident can we be that respondents are telling the truth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</td>
<td>The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Feedback on Section C**

The strength of the investigation lies in its full description of the sampling methods and the data sources. However, the methodology upon which this evaluation stands is not sufficient to meet its objectives because such data sets are not enough to understand the choices individuals make about their sexual behaviours.
## SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Constructive feedback for future reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the findings and conclusions clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence &amp; sound analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within its own terms the evaluation provides findings which do flow from the data generated from the interviews and focus group discussions. However a more insightful analysis of the data would have tried to disentangle issues involved when the objectives of the evaluation were not met or were only partly met. Did respondents identify other factors influencing their choice of partners? At least one respondent mentioned financial pressures. Unexpected findings were not particularly highlighted although the report does bring out the diversity of responses. Further questions arise: why for instance did responses from the 3 project sites differ?</td>
<td>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td>There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are gaps and limitations discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are unexpected findings discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No cost analysis was provided either with respect to the programme itself or to the study. Reference was made to cost implications of choosing one fieldwork site against another without specifying what this actually meant for the evaluation or for the sustainability of the programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Causality here relates to the extent to which this public health campaign influences private behaviour. Testimony of informants is the main track to identify those choices supported by data triangulation using multiple sources of information including a previous study. Stakeholders within the same group as well as from different groups sometimes hold diverse views. These are on occasion mentioned, but hard to explain. References are made to appendices, but these are not attached to this report. Causality in this type of investigation is very hard to pin down conclusively or very clearly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths, weaknesses and implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</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>
<tr>
<td>40 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completeness and insight of conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<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

The findings and conclusions are clearly presented and based on analysis which is sound within the parameters of this type of study. They are relevant but they are by themselves insufficient and more in-depth presentation of the social roots of current behaviours is required.
### SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</th>
<th>Usefulness of recommendations</th>
<th>Appropriate lessons learned</th>
<th>Executive Feedback on Section E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E3 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.</td>
<td>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic. There is already much information in the findings which could be developed, possibly without further fieldwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E4 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object.</td>
<td>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic. No process for implementing the recommendations is offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E5 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic. There is already much information in the findings which could be developed, possibly without further fieldwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E6 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E7 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</strong>&lt;br&gt;This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes</td>
<td>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E8 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E9 Are lessons learned correctly identified?</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic. There is already much information in the findings which could be developed, possibly without further fieldwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E10 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.</td>
<td>2 (Almost)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommendations are not sufficiently developed to identify the target group or to allow judgements on the extent to which they are realistic. There is already much information in the findings which could be developed, possibly without further fieldwork.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constructive feedback for future reports**

Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice.

Conclusions need to be developed into coherent and usable recommendations for end users who also need to be specified. There is already much information in the findings which could be developed, possibly without further fieldwork.
### SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Style and presentation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the basic elements are present. The report is logically structured with a single killer omission. On the front of the report the authors indicate that this is volume 1. This is not explained in the text and no reference is made to further volumes.</td>
<td>The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Is the report logically structured?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apart from an annex on references the other annexes are not attached. Annexes 6 and 7 are mentioned. The rest are not even identified.</td>
<td>Good practice for this section requires authors to set out unambiguously the outputs of the assignment, in this case the contents of all volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</td>
<td>The evaluated object is identified, but not the intended audiences. Consistent with the main body of the report, recommendations are insufficiently developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</td>
<td>It is not known what decisions are upcoming and therefore it is impossible to judge the extent to which this report facilitates that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Can the executive summary stand alone?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Can the executive summary inform decision making?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</td>
<td>The TORs list 5 deliverables. Most are covered within the report except: 3) Documentation presenting selection process of service provider and 5) the PowerPoint which is to be included alongside the final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation in terms of evaluation</td>
<td>Good use is made of interview and focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The authors have extensive experience of research into various aspects of HIV/AIDS which inform the design and delivery of this evaluation.

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

In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/ 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: i. Is the report methodologically appropriate? ii. Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? iii. Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The robustness of this report is not consistent across all sections. In particular there is no explicit commitment to UNICEF’s principles, policies and practices. Surprisingly, the evaluation provides some comfort in the relevance of this public health campaign and the contribution it makes to reducing risks of HIV/AIDS infections, albeit very hard to quantify. This box has required a lot of thought as the assessment is not straightforward. Focusing on the body of fieldwork and the way that has been presented and analysed there is much here of interest and use. We learn a lot about diverse opinions and strategies in these 3 project sites in Namibia, about how males and females in the age cohort report on the decision-making contexts for their sexual relationships and how that is changed by their increasing awareness of vulnerabilities to HIV/AIDS. But for UNICEF strategic managers to use these findings with confidence, the report has to be strengthened in a number of key ways: (i) The evaluation must demonstrate commitment to UNICEF’s priorities, principles and strategies. (ii) The evaluation must have an understanding of the end users and the operational policy environment. (iii) This report needs explain the structure of this volume 1 and how it relates to other volumes. The underlying weakness of this evaluation is that it has a research focus, rather than an understanding of the policy environment and of how different actors in that environment relate to each other and interweave to achieve their sometimes shared, sometimes conflicting objectives.</td>
<td>Not Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical ‘whole’.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a logic to the six sections and they are internally consistent. But although this logical consistency is necessary it is not sufficient to making future decisions. There is a logic to the six sections and they are internally consistent. But although this logical consistency is necessary it is not sufficient to making future decisions.</td>
<td>Not Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The TORs are silent on UNICEF’s priorities and strategies and no set of evaluation criteria are included. They do not specify what use is to be made of findings. The underlying weakness of this evaluation is that it has a research focus, rather than an understanding of the policy environment and of how different actors in that environment relate to each other and interweave to achieve their sometimes shared, sometimes conflicting objectives.</td>
<td>Not Confident to Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report cannot be used with confidence. The underlying weakness of this evaluation is that it has a research focus, rather than an understanding of the policy environment and of how different actors in that environment relate to each other and interweave to achieve their sometimes shared, sometimes conflicting objectives.