<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Nature of Reviewer Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the context of the intervention clearly described?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are the key stakeholders and their roles and responsibilities in programme implementation clearly defined?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Nature of Reviewer Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The report clearly describes the object of evaluation, including the projects making up the assessed programme, its timelines and implementation status, as well as its geographic coverage and budget.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The report provides a good overview of the general status of the programme area, including the context in which the programme was implemented, key stakeholders, and the programme’s objectives.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The report provides an overview of the programme’s main achievements and challenges, including an assessment of its effectiveness and impact, and makes recommendations for improvement.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The report includes a description of the methodology used, including the selection criteria, sampling procedures, and data collection methods.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Nature of Reviewer Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The report briefly (3-5 sentences) assesses top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/advisory elements.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The report could be improved by describing the roles and responsibilities (i.e., technical, financial, etc.) of stakeholders in programme implementation. This could potentially be done using a table format. Also, the specific rights-holder groups and the areas covered by the intervention, (i.e. education, health, social inclusion, etc.), could have been more explicitly described.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The report provides a good overview of the institutions directly benefiting from the programme and their role in national child rights monitoring (CRM) mechanisms. The report provides a good description of the programme’s expected outputs and outcomes, and a theory of change which includes underlying assumptions and risks at each step.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)  

The report would be improved by describing the roles and responsibilities (i.e., technical, financial, etc.) of stakeholders in programme implementation. This could potentially be done using a table format. Also, the specific rights-holder groups and the areas covered by the initiative, (i.e. education, health, social inclusion, etc.), could have been more explicitly described in the report.
The purpose of the evaluation is clearly described. It seeks to produce knowledge and recommendations at a critical point in time, as an UNICEF at mid-point in its Country Programme in Uzbekistan and is embarking on a new Strategic Plan. Evaluative findings will be aligned with the evaluability assessment and the ToC, and will inform the formulation of the new Strategic Plan. The report contains explicit references to the ToC and its practice/added value elements.

Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)

This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

The report presents robust findings that are triangulated with multiple data sources. Findings are structured around the evaluation questions and sub-questions, which makes it easy for the reader to understand the extent to which evaluation questions were answered. Both positive and negative findings are discussed, as are the key factors enabling or hindering programme effectiveness. Furthermore, the report marks out the line of effort and its intended impact, and connects these to the stakeholders responsible for achieving these impacts.

Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)

It is important to ensure that the evaluations clearly present both positive and negative unexpected results. To ensure that this information is presented, an evaluation question is that effect could be included in the evaluation matrix. Should there be no negative unexpected results, the report should mention this explicitly.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

The evaluation was a strong methodological approach that draws on multiple data sources. The report clearly presents the evaluation design, methods, data sources and sampling methods and provides an independent justification for their selection. The report also provides a valid explanation as to why the IRBs criteria is addressed, in addition to standard IRBs criteria. Additionally, the report presents the evaluation questions and explains that these have been slightly modified from those proposed in the ToC (efficacy section is removed). The report also presents the ToC, including the key factors enabling or hindering programme effectiveness, and the accompanying mitigation strategies. Finally, the report is strong at describing ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm).

Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)

This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.
SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)

Question 15. Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?
Yes

Question 16. Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?
Mostly

Question 17. Are recommendations clearly presented?
100%

Overall rating for Section E
Satisfactory

Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Question 18. Are recommendations clearly stated? Are they logically drawn from the findings and conclusions? Recommendations are logically drawn from the findings and conclusions. They are clearly stated and do not fail to meet the criteria above (judgement).
Yes

Question 19. Are recommendations useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and context of use)? Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and context of use).
Yes

Executive Feedback on Section F
Highly Satisfactory

Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

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

Question 20. Have the evaluation report included of relevant information?
Yes

Question 21. Are the recommendations well supported by the evidence? Recommendations are well supported by the evidence.
Yes

Executive Feedback on Section G
Satisfactory

Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Question 22. Is the report logically structured and includes all of the necessary elements (e.g., ToRs, ToC, evaluation matrix, data collection tools, ethics protocols, etc.) that add significant credibility to the report? The report is logically structured and includes all of the necessary elements (e.g., ToRs, ToC, evaluation matrix, data collection tools, ethics protocols, etc.) that add significant credibility to the report.
Yes

Executive Feedback on Section H
Highly Satisfactory

Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.
**Question 3: Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses gender, equity & child rights?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1: UN-SWAP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2: UN-SWAP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3: UN-SWAP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Executive Feedback on Section H**

The executive summary includes a question in this regard in the ToRs.

---

**Executive Feedback on Section I**

Executive summary only includes information that is further developed in the body of the report. On the other hand, additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement) are included in the executive summary needs to, therefore, be further synthesized.

---

**Executive Summary**

The executive summary includes all of the necessary elements to provide end users with a high degree of confidence by decision-makers. It is good practice for the executive summary to not exceed 6 pages so as to effectively inform high-level end users who may not have time to read more than that. The information included in the executive summary needs to, therefore, be further synthesized.

---

**UN-SWAP criteria**

- Criterion 3: The evaluation matrix includes a question on cross-cutting issues that addresses gender, equity, and indicators accompanying other questions.
- Criterion 2: The methodologies provide a good explanation of specific methods and tools used to ensure that sex-disaggregated data was collected and to facilitate the participation of both boys and girls.
- Criterion 1: The findings, conclusions and recommendations provide a consistent gender analysis. The findings and conclusions provide a good analysis of the extent to which the CRM programme is contributing to generating sex-disaggregated data and the report provides a recommendation for improvements in this area.

---

**Additional justifications for UN-SWAP ratings**

- Criterion 3: The evaluation matrix includes a question on cross-cutting issues that addresses gender, equity, and indicators accompanying other questions.
- Criterion 2: The methodologies provide a good explanation of specific methods and tools used to ensure that sex-disaggregated data was collected and to facilitate the participation of both boys and girls.
- Criterion 1: The findings, conclusions and recommendations provide a consistent gender analysis. The findings and conclusions provide a good analysis of the extent to which the CRM programme is contributing to generating sex-disaggregated data and the report provides a recommendation for improvements in this area.

---

**Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)**

It is good practice for the executive summary to not exceed 6 pages so as to effectively inform high-level end users who may not have time to read more than that. The information included in the executive summary needs to, therefore, be further synthesized.