



## 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 UNICEF Nepal Mine Action Activities: Victim-Activated Explosion Injury Surveillance and Mine Risk Education</b>
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2010/010
<b>Date of Review</b>	07/04/2011
<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2010
<b>Region</b>	South Asia Regional Office
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Nepal
<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>	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.
<b>Purpose</b> <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>	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 3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate
<b>Result</b> <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>	4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme
<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 (4. Child Protection)
<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>	7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION					
Question	cc	Remarks			
<b>Object and context</b>					
<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 object of the evaluation is relatively well described. There is a great deal of detail on both the context and elements of Mine Action in the report. Background is generally very relevant. Details of the object of the evaluation (victim-activated monitoring and mine risk education) are provided as part of the findings which runs the risk of mixing what is meant to take place with actual results. Moreover, the relationship with other stakeholder activities could have been more detailed. At times the bigger picture becomes obscured by the many details provided.	<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>2 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				
<b>3 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				
<b>Theory of Change</b>					
<b>4 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.	Almost	<b>Confident to Act</b>	The national context of the evaluation and some of the forthcoming decision points is covered in detail and is relevant. In addition to this, the Mine Action component of UNICEF's work and the two aspects covered in this evaluation are also described. The report refers to human rights standards, but does not say what these are. It also does not present the full results chain or situate the evaluation in the corporate UNICEF context.		
<b>Stakeholders and their contributions</b>					
<b>5 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 report includes detailed lists of stakeholders and the roles of each. Contributions including those of UNICEF are mentioned in various instances, though could have been brought together more clearly.	Several of the aspects referred to in this section are well covered partly because they are described at length. At the same time, good summaries of the results framework is not included. Evaluations should always seek to present the results chain as it was conceptualised by the intervention designers. The use of diagrams and tables can help in presenting large amounts of information about the object in a clear, concise and comprehensive way.
<b>6 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>7 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes				
<b>Implementation Status</b>					
<b>8 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 current state on MA and the decisions likely to be faced imminently are clearly articulated.			
<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 description of the context and to a lesser extent the UNICEF intervention is general comprehensive and relevant. This could have been enhanced through being more concise, referencing relevant human rights standards and including a summary of the relevant UNICEF results frameworks.</b>				

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE					
Question	cc	Remarks			
<b>Purpose, objectives and scope</b>					
<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.	Yes	The purpose and the objective of the evaluation is cited directly from the terms of reference. They are clear and correctly identified. However, they are not elaborated on in any way, and no specific objectives or evaluation questions are identified. The scope is identified and justified to some degree, but this is done later in the evaluation report.	<b>B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>  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.	<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
<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	Almost				
<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)	Yes				
<b>Evaluation framework</b>					
<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 judgments 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>	Yes	The objective calls for the standard OECD DAC evaluation criteria to be used. These are applied to the evaluation of MRE, but not to VA. The evaluation of VA uses a different set of public health evaluation criteria. These do appear to be relevant and add value, but it is not explained why the full OECD DAC criteria were fully replaced instead of just being complemented.	<b>Confident to Act</b>	Purpose, objectives and (to a degree) scope are all defined and provide a strong organising framework for the evaluation report. The evaluation framework is also elaborated throughout the report and is enhanced with public health standards (although the justification of this variation is not articulated).	It is good practice to follow the DAC evaluation criteria and to make explicit why some of the criteria were not used in any specific evaluation.
<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.	Almost				
<b>Executive Feedback on Section B</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>Purpose of the evaluation is provided and the evaluation objectives and criteria are clearly used to guide the report though this is partly defined over the course of its pages rather than in the introductory section. The DAC criteria are used for part of the evaluation, while public health standards are used for the evaluation of the surveillance system, which is though not sufficiently justified.</b>				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY			
Question	cc	Remarks	
<b>Data collection</b>			
<b>14 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.	Yes	The evaluation process is described in some detail including methods and tools used and detailed lists of the individuals interviewed. This could have been improved by justifying methodological choices, inclusion of details on the analytical processes used to interpret the data and arrive at findings and discuss limitations of the methodology used.	<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>
<b>15 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 & overcome data limits	Yes		
<b>Ethics</b>			
<b>16 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	Yes	The report refers to UNEG standards for evaluation - which include ethics. There are also a number of references to issues of confidentiality, especially in relation to VA reporting. However, the report does not fully discuss the safeguards required or adopted for the key informant interviews used by the evaluation itself.	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<b>17 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	Almost		
<b>Results Based Management</b>			
<b>18 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&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.	Yes	The VA monitoring is a surveillance system and the analysis included in the report regarding its performance as a public health monitoring system is sufficient. In the MRE section, specific attention is given to monitoring and evaluation. As with the rest of the report, this tends to read like a detailed audit rather than an evaluation of performance. Reference is moreover made to a lack of monitoring data being available to determine aspects of effectiveness, efficiency and impact.	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Almost Confident to Act</b></p> <p>Though the methodology as such can be expected to answer the evaluation questions concerned there are various limitations to the methodology aspects of the report. Details on methods and tools of data gathering and sources of data and information could have been enhanced by justifying methodological choices and providing details on analysis and limitations to the methodology. Aspects of monitoring systems are assessed and human rights standards mentioned though the use of the latter leaves to be desired.</p>
<b>19 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.	Yes		
<b>Human Rights, Gender and Equity</b>			
<b>20 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?</b> This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, 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	Yes	Evaluation standards, including for human rights, are mentioned in the introductory sections. In addition to this, some information - where available - is presented and discussed disaggregated by sex, age group, region and wealth quartile. This shows a good awareness by the evaluators. However, the human rights standards and benchmarks that would be applicable to mine action are not identified or integrated into the analytical framework. The	<p>A methodology section would ideally articulate the approach that is being used to determine what data to collect, from who, how and how it is to be analysed. This goes beyond simply stating what tools have been used. In addition to this, all methodology sections need to describe the limitations of that methodology, why they are acceptable, what the implications are, and how they have been mitigated where possible.</p>

<p><b>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity &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>	Almost	very brief methodological section also does not investigate relationships between rights holder and duty bearers. With a stronger methodological framework it is likely that the evaluators could have built on the data that was gathered (as part of an explicit sampling strategy) in a more rigorous examination of human rights issues.			
<p><b>22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women &amp; child rights)?</b>  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 &amp; structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations.</p>	Almost				
<p><b>23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT?</b>  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 &amp; structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.</p>	Almost				
<p><b>24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY?</b>  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 &amp; aspects of equity.</p>	Almost				
<b>Stakeholder participation</b>					
<p><b>25 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>	Almost	The stakeholders who participated in the evaluation as interviewees are very clearly identified. However, the role that each took in commissioning, shaping, conducting and interpreting the evaluation is not identified: neither is the rationale for this degree of participation. Furthermore, the evaluation poses some questions about the value of life in terms of investing in Mine Action compared to other areas of risk: however, apart from a			

<p><b>26 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>	Almost	<p>other areas of risk. However, apart from a school visit it does not appear that affected populations participated directly in the evaluation. These could have provided some richer material for the questions around value that emerged.</p>		
<b>Methodological robustness</b>				
<p><b>27 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>	No	<p>The methodology combines desk review with field visits and includes interviews with key informants of a variety of key stakeholder. Moreover, use is made of the KAP survey results. As such this does provide sufficient means for answering the evaluation questions.</p>		
<p><b>28 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>	Yes	<p>Methodology could have been described more in detail and choices justified. Limitations of the methodology are not articulated in the report. The evaluators do not identify a counterfactual (what would Nepal have looked like without UNICEF VA monitoring and MRE). Although this could likely have only been done theoretically, it could have drawn upon evidence from other mine action programmes in terms of the difference that these two strategies make.</p>		
<p><b>29 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>	Almost	<p>Methodology could have been described more in detail and choices justified. Limitations of the methodology are not articulated in the report. The evaluators do not identify a counterfactual (what would Nepal have looked like without UNICEF VA monitoring and MRE). Although this could likely have only been done theoretically, it could have drawn upon evidence from other mine action programmes in terms of the difference that these two strategies make.</p>		
<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>Though the methodology as such can be expected to answer the evaluation questions concerned there are various limitations to the methodology aspects of the report. Details on methods and tools of data gathering and sources of data and information could have been enhanced by justifying methodological choices and providing details on analysis and limitations to the methodology. Aspects of monitoring systems are assessed and human rights standards mentioned though the use of the latter leaves to be desired.</b></p>			

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>Completeness and logic of findings</b>				
<b>30 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.	Almost	Findings vary in quality. They are presented at length and include substantial discussion. Linkage to evidence varies. Each evaluation criterion is defined before presentation of the findings responding to it. In several incidences the report starts to present raw observations or audit-like reviews of process, rather than the central findings and the reasoning behind these. This results in a very long report that can be hard to navigate around. Nevertheless, the findings respond systematically to the evaluation framework, identifies and discusses gaps, and elaborates on unexpected findings. The use of 'strengths', 'challenges' and 'unknowns' appears a useful way of presenting the findings.	<b>Almost Confident to Act</b>	<b>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence &amp; sound analysis?</b> 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.
<b>31 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.	Yes			
<b>32 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.	Yes			
<b>33 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.	Yes			
<b>34 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.	Yes			
<b>Cost Analysis</b>				
<b>35 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.	Yes	A full cost analysis was not feasible. However, the reasons for this are fully explained in the report and some working assumptions are presented in its place.		
<b>Contribution and causality</b>				
<b>36 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.	Yes	Barring the low presence of the voice of affected populations, the report does cover a broad range of stakeholders and uses the evidence gained to constructively identify causation and attribution as much as the methodology allows for.		
<b>37 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.	Almost			
				<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
				All evaluations require a conclusions section that uses the evidence generated as part of the findings section to offer deeper insight into the performance of an intervention. This is the opportunity to link back to the evaluation's purpose and objectives.

<p><b>38 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>	<p>Yes</p>				
<b>Strengths, weaknesses and implications</b>					
<p><b>39 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>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Each evaluation criterion is presented along with strengths, challenges and unknowns in the findings section. These also explore future implications (and are well referenced back to the context). There are no conclusions as defined by UNEG standards.</p>			
<p><b>40 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>	<p>Almost</p>				
<b>Completeness and insight of conclusions</b>					
<p><b>41 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>	<p>No</p>	<p>There are no conclusions as defined by UNEG standards. Conclusions should add deeper insight to findings and look underneath what has taken place. In this report findings lead directly to recommendations for iterative operational changes.</p>			
<p><b>42 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>	<p>No</p>				
<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>Findings are clearly articulated, if not always sufficiently linked to evidence and at times lacking in analysis. The use of the 'strengths, challenges, and unknowns' is useful. However, this is unfortunately not carried through into a deeper analysis on the level of evaluation criteria concerned and beyond, resulting in a set of evaluative statements as required by UNICEF/UNEG standards for conclusions.</b></p>				

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			
Question	cc	Remarks	
<b>Relevance and clarity of recommendations</b>			
<b>43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</b> Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	Recommendations follow directly from findings and are clearly linked to the findings presented. They all relate to the objectives of the evaluation. However, there are an enormous number of highly detailed recommendations. These are not prioritised though they are grouped under five and six headings for the surveillance system and mine risk education respectively. A consequence of not having conclusions at the level of the evaluation criteria used is that there are no holistic recommendations made that would be relevant at a the overall managerial and strategic levels of Mine Action in Nepal.	<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>44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</b> Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes		
<b>45 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.	No		
<b>Usefulness of recommendations</b>			
<b>46 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.	Almost	<b>Almost Confident to Act</b>	Recommendations are directly linked to the findings and generally appear to be relevant, feasible and actionable. However, these are not well prioritised for management and are very large in number: limiting their usefulness. In addition to this, the report does not identify any lessons learned, though it is not clear whether this was a requirement in the TOR.
<b>47 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	Yes		
<b>48 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		
<b>Appropriate lessons learned</b>			
<b>49 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.	No	<b>Almost Confident to Act</b>	Recommendations that are directly linked to findings tend to be technically relevant. However, this also generates a large number of detailed recommendations. To be of maximum use, this large number of recommendations need to be prioritised for managers, and the first priority issues - with justifications - clearly identified. In addition to this, all reports should include generalised lessons learned.
<b>50 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.	No		
<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>A very large set of recommendations is presented which tend to be highly technical on details of program implementation, whilst being relevant, are not prioritised in a useful way for managers. In addition to this, the report does not identify any lessons learned, though it is not clear whether this was a requirement of the TOR.</b>		

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR					
Question	cc	Remarks			
<b>Style and presentation</b>			<b>Almost Confident to Act</b>	<p><b>F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>A logically organised report, which often appears to adopt a focus on details, which can make it difficult to find the key issues that are being discussed. However, in terms of actual information inclusion, the report is fairly comprehensive. Notable omissions include the TOR as an annex and any reference to findings in the Executive Summary, which thus cannot be expected to inform decision-making</p>	
<p><b>51. 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</p>	Yes	<p>Barring the absence of TORs, the report contains all relevant data. The annexes in particular are used to present a range of MRE and VA materials, as well as relevant data. The overall report follows a clear logical structure; however, its detailed 'audit-style' reporting makes it a long document that can be hard to follow or navigate through.</p>			<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>52 Is the report logically structured?</b> Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons learnt</p>	Yes				
<p><b>53 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</p>	Almost				
<p><b>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b></p>	Yes				
<b>Executive Summary</b>					
<p><b>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</b> If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A</p>	Yes	<p>The Executive summary does not include detail on findings, jumping straight from the purpose section into recommendations. As a result it cannot be used confidently as a stand alone document to inform decision-making.</p>	<p>Reports need to be comprehensive, but they also need to be accessible and concise if they are going to communicate well. This report already makes extensive use of end notes and annexes: and might have benefited from including more of the detailed data at the end of the report rather than in the main text. Executive Summaries should be able to stand alone, and include reference to main findings and conclusions, as well as recommendations. Finally, all reports should have the TOR attached.</p>		
<p><b>56 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</p>	Almost				
<p><b>57 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</p>	No				
<p><b>58 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.</p>	No				
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section F</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>A strongly organised report, that at times uses a level of detail that risks losing the main points of analysis. Although a lot of information is included, essential elements of the Executive Summary are missing, as is the TOR which is not included as an annex.</b></p>				
<b>Additional Information</b>					
Question		Remarks			
<p><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</p>		<p>NO TERMS OF REFERENCE WERE ATTACHED TO THE REPORT. ALL FUTURE EVALUATIONS SHOULD HAVE THE ORIGINAL TOR INCLUDED AS AN ANNEX.</p>			
<p><b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation</p>		<p>The evaluation made reference to specific standards and guides for evaluating relevant public health systems/issues. In addition to this, a clear definition of each evaluation criterion was provided.</p>			

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

In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise

The VA monitoring is managed by an indigenous NGO that, whilst facing some sustainability issues in the short term, can offer some experience of effective monitoring systems that are harmonised with wider public health monitoring.

OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: $\Omega$ / 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?	Almost	Each section contains strong elements. However, as noted above, there are also some essential parts of an evaluation missing: most noticeably in terms of findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.	<b>Almost Confident to Act</b> From the report it is clear that the evaluators brought some considerable technical expertise to this evaluation, that an extensive set of data was collected, and that this was meticulously analysed against internationally referenced standards. The evaluation framework itself was very clear and the report makes reference to all the criteria concerned. However, the analysis primarily remains on the level of aspects of evaluation criteria and does not reach beyond and conclusions nor lessons learned are in effect addressed. Recommendations consist of a long list of highly detailed issues which are not prioritised for managers.
<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 appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Yes	The evaluators use a strong evaluation framework and this holds together the report as a whole, developing consistent storylines through the different sections.	
<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.	ToRs	The TORs are not included. It is a requirement that TORs should be attached as an annex to all reports.	
	Other	The evaluators refer in the report to it being a 'process' evaluation. This differs from the purpose and objective stated. It may be that mixed messages were communicated to evaluators and that they chose to focus on technical aspects as a result.	
<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 technical integrity of this evaluation in terms of public health and mine action is not in question, and it delivers a set of relevant technical recommendations. However, as an evaluation that responds to OECD DAC criteria it does not provide sufficient analysis on the level of the evaluation criteria and does not results in evaluative statements on this level and beyond. Recommendations are overly detailed and do not address more strategic issues as asked for in the purpose of the evaluation.</b>		