



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	Very Confident to Act	Confident to Act	Almost Confident to Act	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

UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System	UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System	UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards
--	--	---

	Response			
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluación de medio término del Programa conjunto: "De la Retórica a la Realidad: Hacia la Equidad de Género y Empoderamiento de las Mujeres a través de la Participación y Prácticas de Género en los Presupuestos Públicos"			
Report sequence number	2011-002	Date of Review	18/04/2012	Year of the Evaluation Report
Region	The Americas and Caribbean Regional Office		Country(ies)	Nicaragua
Type of Report	Evaluation		TORs Present	No
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC			
Classification of Evaluation Report				Comments
Geographical <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)</i>	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country			
Management <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.5 Not clear from Report			
Purpose <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>	3.6 Project: An evaluation which is step-by-step process of collecting, recording and organisation information about the project results including immediate results, short-term outputs and long-term project outcomes			
Result <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			
MTSP Correspondence <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>	5.3 Cross-cutting: Addresses issues that are named as cross-cutting strategies of the MTSP or otherwise known to operate within all MTSP areas. Includes but is not limited to the human rights-based approach to programming, gender equity, knowledge management, evaluation, & communication for development.			MDG-F Joint Programme. Window: Gender equity and women empowerment
Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.4 Not clear from Report			
Timing / Stage	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		
Object and context				
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? 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.	Almost	The object is not adequately described. Some of their components are presented within findings. Factors on context are included, such as the international frame (MDG-F Joint Programmes) and national policies and laws, but almost nothing is mentioned about the socioeconomic conditions of the beneficiaries.	A/ Does the report 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.	
2 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? 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	Almost			
3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Almost			
Theory of Change				
4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? 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	The objectives, effects and outcomes of the programme are presented, however their relationships are not clearly explained or articulated within a results chain.	Almost Confident to Act The object is not adequately described; its purpose, effects and products are presented, but the theory of change is not clearly explained. The international framework of the joint programme (MDG-F and UNDAF) is described, as well as the government commitment to gender equity. However other factors on the context are just briefly included, such as national policies and laws, and almost nothing is mentioned about demographic and the socioeconomic conditions of the beneficiaries.	
Stakeholders and their contributions				
5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes	Key stakeholders, both governmental institutions and UN Agencies are identified, and their contribution is stated; UNICEF is only mentioned as programme participant. The role of different committees is described; however their members are not identified.		
6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? 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	Almost			
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	No			
Implementation Status				
8 Is the implementation status described? 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 implementation status of the programme is described and assessed; problems are highlighted and discussed, actions that have to be developed in the immediate future are stated; no important changes have been identified.		
Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The object is not adequately described; its purpose, effects and products are presented, but the theory of change is not clearly explained. The international framework of the joint programme is described, as well as the government commitment to gender equity. However other factors on the context are just briefly included such as national policies and laws, and almost nothing is mentioned about the socioeconomic conditions of the beneficiaries.			

Constructive feedback for future reports
Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice

The reports should provide under a specific heading a complete description of the object, including the theory of change. Stakeholders involved and their role and contribution should also be clearly identified, as well as the beneficiaries.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE					
Question	cc	Remarks			
Purpose, objectives and scope					
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? 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	Evaluation purpose and objectives are clearly presented, but the expected users are not identified; the scope is stated briefly, though evaluation questions are included in an annex. Objectives and scope are related to the purpose of the evaluation.	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation? 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.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? 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				
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? 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				
Evaluation framework					
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements 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>	Almost	Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability are used to analyse the programme; but they are not clearly justified, neither referred to as OECD-DAC criteria.	Almost Confident to Act	Evaluation purpose and objectives are clearly presented, but the expected users are not identified; the scope is stated briefly, though questions are included in an annex. Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability are used to analyse the programme; but they are not clearly justified, neither referred to as OECD-DAC criteria.	Purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation require a clear presentation, which should include who needs the information and how it will be used. The report should also explain and justify the analytical criteria and standards used for the evaluation.
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? 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				
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	Evaluation purpose and objectives are clearly presented, but the expected users are not identified; the scope is stated briefly, though questions are included in an annex. Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability are used to analyse the programme; but they are not clearly justified, neither referred to as OECD-DAC criteria.				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Data collection			
<p>14 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.</p>	Yes	The report does not mention the analytical approach. Data collection techniques are described and data sources are stated; their rationale is not clearly presented, though the way that they were used and the information that was collected are explained. No sample selection criteria are included; it is stated, however, that all of key actors were covered. No limitations are identified other than the impossibility to visit all the municipalities. Data collection instruments and synthesis of workshops are included in annexes, providing useful information.	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound? 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. 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>
<p>15 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 & overcome data limits</p>	Almost		
Ethics			
<p>16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? 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</p>	No	No ethical considerations are mentioned	<p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>17 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</p>	N/A		
Results Based Management			
<p>18 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&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.</p>	Almost	The monitoring and evaluation system is not well assessed; aspects of procedures are mainly address (meetings, data base design); there is not a description of the system, only the need to be implemented is highlighted. The logframe (effects, results, products) is used to assess the achievements of the programme, but there is no attention to indicators. It has to be noted though, that some recommendations are included on this regard.	<p>Confident to Act The description of the methodology is reasonably transparent. Data sources are stated and data collection techniques are explained; however the criteria for sample selection of locations visited is not presented. A triangulation is used including participatory methods to allow stakeholders the discussion of results, identification of lessons learned and recommendations; it is also stated that all of key actors were covered. The methodology appears to be capable of providing answers to most of the questions in the context of the evaluation; but it has to be noted that limitations on information are not mentioned.</p>
<p>19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&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.</p>	Almost		
Human Rights, Gender and Equity			
			<p>Special attention should be given to the description of the methodology. This includes an explanation and justification of analytical approach and data collection methods. The methodology needs to incorporate human rights, gender equality and equity frameworks in order to provide the appropriate information on this regard and accordingly to the purpose and scope of the evaluation.</p>

<p>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? 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</p>	Yes	The incorporation of human rights base approach and other international agreements into the programme design is assessed. Aspects regarding gender equity and women empowerment are principally addressed since these are the object or goal of this joint programme. However the methodology does not mention these issues.
<p>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.</p>	Yes	
<p>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.</p>	Almost	
<p>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.</p>	Almost	
<p>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.</p>	Almost	
Stakeholder participation		

<p>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.</p>	Almost	Participation of stakeholders is referred to in the methodology; but the rationale is not explained. This level of participation can be considered appropriate taking into account the short time for field work.		
<p>26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & 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 & preferable.</p>	Yes			
Methodological robustness				
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual? 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	There is no attempt for constructing a counterfactual. A triangulation is used: data collection is made by document revision, questionnaires, interviews, focal groups and workshops using participatory methods to allow the different stakeholder (beneficiaries and institutional) to discuss about the results, to identify lessons learned and to make recommendations. No limitations are stated. The methodology appears to be capable of providing answers to most of the evaluation questions.		
<p>28 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Yes			
<p>29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? 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>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The description of the methodology is reasonably transparent. Data sources are stated and data collection techniques are explained; however sample selection criteria are not presented. Participatory methods are used to allow stakeholders the discussion of results, identification of lessons learned and recommendations. The methodology used seems to be capable of providing answers to most of the questions in the context of the evaluation; but it has to be noted that limitations on information are not mentioned.</p>			

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings				
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? 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	The evaluation makes a reasonable effort to respond to most of the questions according to the stated criteria. However, findings demonstrate only to a certain extent the progression to results; the data source are not always referred to, and the analysis is rather weak; outputs, outcomes and some impacts are listed (several are testimonies) without an accurate distinction. Some gaps and unexpected findings and its implications are addressed. There is no mention of data limitations.	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? 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.	
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes			
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Almost			
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? 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.	Almost			
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	Yes			
Cost Analysis				
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? 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.	No	A cost analysis is not presented and neither a justification; brief information on financial execution is stated, as well as problems related with the delay of instalments.	Almost Confident to Act Findings present a response to most of the questions according to the stated criteria. However, the analysis is rather weak; the progression to results is demonstrated only to a certain extent and causal reasons for achievements or failures are almost not discussed. Data sources are not always referred to, and outputs, outcomes and some impacts are listed without an accurate distinction. Conclusions add limited value to findings; its presentation is not the most appropriate one; however they are relevant for the evaluation end users.	
Contribution and causality				
36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.	Almost	Stakeholder contributions for results are not assigned in all cases; and the report makes reference to the Programme in general regarding their achievements or weaknesses.		
37 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? 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	Causal reasons are briefly identified, but are almost not discussed. It can be inferred that conclusions considered the views of different stakeholders, though references to them are few.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	

<p>38 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? 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>	Almost			
Strengths, weaknesses and implications				
<p>39 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? 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>	Almost	<p>Constraints regarding the implementation model (such as application of different rules by the UN Agencies, delays and lack of alignment in report formats and process) are addressed. Conclusions pay more attention to the stronger aspects of the programme than to the weaker ones.</p>		
<p>40 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? 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>	Almost			
Completeness and insight of conclusions				
<p>41 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? 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>	Almost	<p>Conclusions add limited value to findings. The presentation is not the most appropriate one; it includes information about the programme and the evaluation methodology, and also some recommendations. However conclusions are relevant for the evaluation stakeholders and end users.</p>		
<p>42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? 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>	Almost			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>Findings present a response to most of the questions according to the stated criteria. However, the analysis is rather weak; the progression to results is demonstrated only to a certain extent; data are not always referred to, and outputs, outcomes and impacts are listed without an accurate distinction. Conclusions add limited value to findings; its presentation is not the most appropriate one; however they are relevant for the evaluation end users.</p>			

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Relevance and clarity of recommendations				
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Almost	Recommendations do not make reference to findings; some seems to be grounded on the evidence, but others are drawn out on information not presented in the report.	E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable? 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.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes	Recommendations are relevant to the purpose of the evaluation; however they are not prioritized, and some of them are not adequately and clearly formulated, moreover, some are over-specific.		
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? 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.	Almost			
Usefulness of recommendations				
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? 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	Most of the recommendations identify the target group for action; a number of them are realistic and actionable, but others less so. The process for their development is not presented, apart from what is stated in the methodology.	Almost Confident to Act	Recommendations have to be grounded in findings and conclusions; they should be prioritized, actionable and clearly stated to better inform decision makers.
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Almost			
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? 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.	Almost			
Appropriate lessons learned				
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? 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.	Almost	Lessons learned are identified; they are rather simplistic and specific for the evaluated object (joint programme), but can be applied to other programmes.		
50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	Almost			
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	Recommendations are relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and most identify the target group for action. However, some of them are made up on information not presented in the report; moreover, they are not prioritized and some are over-specific; a number of them are realistic and actionable, but other less so. Lessons learned are rather simplistic, but can be applied to other joint programmes.			

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Style and presentation				
51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? 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	Almost	No all of the required information is included; the name of the organization commissioning the evaluation, location of the object and evaluation time frame (which are stated in the executive summary) are missing out; acronyms are incomplete. Annexes contain useful information such as data collections instruments, synthesis of workshops and an interview guide, which includes the evaluation questions; TOR is missing. The structure of the report is not good enough; conclusions are presented after recommendations.	Almost Confident to Act	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? 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.
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Almost			
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? 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	Almost			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Yes			
Executive Summary				
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	The executive summary includes all the basic elements briefly described; while findings and conclusions are presented without distinction, recommendations are listed in their entirety. It could inform decision making to a limited extent.		Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	Almost			
57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Almost			
58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Yes			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>		The structure of the report is not completely satisfactory; while most of the sections are logical articulated, conclusions are presented after recommendations. The report also presents certain weaknesses in terms of order in the presentation of some information, clarity of the writing linked to the quality of the analysis.		
Additional Information				
Question		Remarks		
i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? 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		NO TERMS OF REFERENCE WERE ATTACHED TO THE REPORT. ALL FUTURE EVALUATIONS SHOULD HAVE THE ORIGINAL TOR INCLUDED AS AN ANNEX.		
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation				

iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation

In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise

OVERALL RATING			
Question	cc	Remarks	OVERALL RATING Informed by the answers above, apply the reasonable person test to answer the following question: Ω/ 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.
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: 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	All the six sections of the report contain useful information, but at the same time, undergo some weaknesses. Certain elements are missing out in opening pages and in the object description, scarce detail in national context and limited level of analysis in findings. The methodology seems to be appropriate, and most of the questions have been responded; however a better level on analysis in findings and conclusions would have been desirable as well as recommendation which are not prioritized and also need some improvement.	The report does address the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, using a generally appropriate methodology. Nevertheless, findings do need improvement in terms of evidence presentation and analysis. Conclusions and recommendations are relevant for the purpose concerned; however both should be improved in relation to their formulation, focus and prioritization, in order to reach the required standards.
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 appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Almost	The report does hold together and there is coherence among sections; however conclusions are presented after recommendations.	
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.	ToRs		
	Other		
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	With a little more work this report could be satisfactory. It does address the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, using a generally appropriate methodology. Nonetheless, findings do need improvement in terms of evidence presentation and analysis. Conclusions and recommendations are relevant for the purpose concerned; however both should also be improved in relation to its formulation, focus and prioritization.		