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	**Helping the Invisible Children: Evaluation Report**

Report sequence number	2011-013	**Date of Review**	10/4/12	**Year of the Evaluation Report**	2012
Region	Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO			**Country(ies)**	Romania
Type of Report	Evaluation			**TORs Present**	Yes
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC				

Classification of Evaluation Report		Comments
Geographical *(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)*	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 *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)*	2.5 Not clear from Report	
Purpose *(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)*	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 *(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)*	4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control	The evaluation intends to look at impact, but has only been operational for a short time, so the actual results are only at output level.
MTSP Correspondence *(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)*	5.1 Sectoral: addresses issues within only one of the five MTSP focus areas (4. Child Protection)	
Level of Independence *(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)*	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	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
			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.	*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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.	Yes	There is a generally good description of the object, including the key stakeholders, results chain and strategies for implementation. Costs are discussed later in the report. Information is included on the key regulatory and policy frameworks and how these are relevant to the object. The context is reflected in the findings, which are illuminated by it.		
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	Yes			
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.	Yes			
Theory of Change			The report describes the object of the evaluation object comprehensively. The results chain has been extrapolated by the evaluators, and there is a good description of the context, including the relevant policies and strategies (which then illuminate the findings). Stakeholders and their contributions are also listed in full.	The list of the main stakeholder groups, their contribution to the project / programme and their role in the evaluation, should always be specified in evaluation reports.
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.	Yes	There is a good description of the results chain, which has been extrapolated by the evaluators. This locates some of the results at the wrong level (e.g. some of the outcomes described are really outputs) but it does clearly explain the intended progression towards results.		
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	All the main stakeholder groups are set out, and the role of beneficiaries is also included. Contributions are listed, including those of UNICEF.		
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	Outstanding			
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
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 is described including its limitations for the evaluation (short implementation period).		

(left column rating band: Confident to Act)

Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The report describes the object of the evaluation object comprehensively. The results chain has been extrapolated by the evaluators, and there is a good description of the context, including the relevant policies and strategies (which then illuminate the findings). Stakeholders and their contributions are also listed in full.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Question	cc	Remarks	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
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	The purpose of the evaluation is clear, and the reason for its early implementation is stated. The objectives and scope of work are well described and are clearly connected to the purpose. The users of the evaluation are listed in detail.	**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** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	Yes			
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 *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Yes	The methodology section gives a full list of evaluation criteria, which are mainly the OECD ones plus coherence and connectedness. Full definitions are provided. However, not all the criteria appear relevant to the study e.g. connectedness and coherence are usually applied to evaluate humanitarian interventions, and impact and sustainability are very difficult to apply to an intervention that has only been operational for a few months. There is some limited explanation for this, but it does not respond to the main concern.	**Almost Confident to Act** The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are well set out, as is the timeliness and utility of the study. The selected evaluation criteria are listed and defined, although there are some questions about their appropriateness e.g. connectedness and coherence usually apply to humanitarian interventions. If the use of these criteria has been agreed with the commissioning agency, the reasons for this need greater clarification.	Evaluation managers / ToRs should specify which evaluation criteria are applicable to evaluate which interventions, in line with international guidance. This should then be agreed with the evaluation team.
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. *Up to two sentences*		The purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation are well set out, as is the timeliness and utility of the study. The selected evaluation criteria are listed and defined, although there are some questions about their appropriateness e.g. connectedness and coherence usually apply to humanitarian interventions. If the use of these criteria has been agreed with the commissioning agency, the reasons for this need greater clarification.		

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY

Question	cc	Remarks	C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?	Constructive feedback for future reports
				Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice
Data collection			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.	
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.	Almost	The report sets out in detail the data collection techniques applied, including sampling, though analytical methods are less clearly explained and sampling methods need more explanation e.g. how are communities classified as 'developed or 'underdeveloped'. Limitations are very clearly explained, as well as mitigation strategies - this has been very well done.		
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	Outstanding		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.	
Ethics				
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	Yes	Efforts have been made to address ethical concerns e.g. around the interviewing process and confidentiality / anonymity issues. The report does not explicitly reference the UNEG standards but could do so.		
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	Almost			
Results Based Management			The methodology is sufficient to respond to the evaluation questions. It is generally well described, including an explanation of the methods used and how triangulation has been achieved, and a discussion of limitations. The study's approach to rights, including equity issues, are well explained, but there could be more attention paid to a systematic mainstreaming of gender issues.	Evaluations should all report on gender considerations, including in data collection, analysis and the development of conclusions and recommendations.
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.	Yes	The monitoring system is fully reviewed and constructively criticised. There is limited monitoring data available, but the evaluation does apply this where it is present, and draws on the M&E framework more generally.		
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.	Yes			
Human Rights, Gender and Equity				
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	Yes	The report makes effort to explain how it has addressed rights issues, and adopts rights-based language to the extent feasible. There is some use of sex-disaggregated data but gender is not systemically mainstreamed, although equity issues are covered to a reasonable extent. The main international rights frameworks could be mentioned more explicitly, however and the analysis could emphasise these concerns to a greater extent.		

(Column note: vertical label in the methodology column reads "Almost Confident to Act")

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.	Almost	
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.	Yes	
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.	Almost	
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.	Yes	
Stakeholder participation		
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.	Yes	The evaluation has adopted a participatory approach, which is well explained. The levels of participation are appropriate and have been managed well.

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.	Yes	

Methodological robustness		
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.	N/A	A counterfactual is not constructed, and the reasons for this - which are valid - are explained. The methodology is sufficient adequate to respond to the evaluation questions, and includes explanation on how triangulation has been achieved, and how the risk of bias has been avoided.
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.	Yes	
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	Yes	

Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The methodology is sufficient to respond to the evaluation questions. It is generally well described, including an explanation of the methods used and how triangulation has been achieved, and a discussion of limitations. The study's approach to rights, including equity issues, are well explained, but there could be more attention paid to a systematic mainstreaming of gender issues.

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	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.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	Findings are clearly presented and based on relevant evidence. However, at times the evidence base is slim, for example where based on survey data and not fully triangulated. The weakest sections are those where the evidence does not respond to the evaluation criteria e.g. the impact and sustainability sections, where data is very limited. This has occurred mainly as a result of applying inappropriate evaluation criteria, which the evidence base then struggles to respond to. Gaps and limitations should be much more fully discussed.		
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.	Almost			
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.	No		Almost Confident to Act	The findings do respond directly to the evaluation questions and criteria, however at times and evidence base is limited, due to the fact that some of the criteria are simply inapplicable to this sort of intervention / this stage of implementation. Conclusions reflect both strengths and weaknesses but they could add more depth and insight, plus reflect some of the more critical underlying issues affecting project performance.	To avoid weaknesses in the evidence base, evaluations should only apply relevant criteria, and where evidence is not available to respond to the criteria, state this and the reasons for it openly.
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.	N/A			
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.	Almost	Some attempt at a cost analysis is presented, but limited information is available given the very early stage of project implementation.		
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	The report does make effort to connect results to stakeholders, though this could be more clearly explained. Causal reasons for success or failure are at times picked out, but not systematically so. The conclusions are assumed to take account of a diverse range of stakeholders given the participatory approach, but this could be more clearly explained.		
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.	Yes			

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. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Almost	

Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
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.	Yes	The implications of ongoing constraints are addressed and conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the object (they are even in tone).
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.	Yes	

Completeness and insight of conclusions		
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.	Almost	The conclusions add some depth and insight, but at times simply sum up the findings. Some of them do identify the underlying issues, however. They are pitched at an appropriate level to the users of the study.
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).	Yes	

Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The findings do respond directly to the evaluation questions and criteria, however at times and evidence base is limited, due to the fact that some of the criteria are simply inapplicable to this sort of intervention / this stage of implementation. Conclusions reflect both strengths and weaknesses but they could add more depth and insight, plus reflect some of the more critical underlying issues affecting project performance.

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks	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 *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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.	Yes	Recommendations are grounded in the evidence, and are relevant to the object / purpose. They are prioritised by being grouped in logical categories.		
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes			
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.	Yes			
Usefulness of recommendations			The recommendations are relevant, specific, targeted, actionable and realistic. They also have clear responsibilities assigned, and the process for their development is made explicit.	Recommendations should always be prioritised, with the target group for action clearly assigned.
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.	Yes	The recommendations are specific and have particular responsibilities assigned, so that the target group for action is identified. They are realistic for the context and there is a clear statement of how they have been developed.		
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	Yes			
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.	Yes			
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 scattered throughout the report and are not really generalisable to other contexts. They could usefully be extracted and held in a separate section, as there are some useful findings for other projects here.		
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.	No			
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**The recommendations are relevant, specific, targeted, actionable and realistic. They also have clear responsibilities assigned, and the process for their development is made explicit.**		

Confident to Act

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

Question	cc	Remarks	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.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	Yes	The basic elements are all included. The report is logically structured and has a clear narrative thread. The annexes have been well written and add considerable value.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes		The report is logically structured, clear and coherent. It reads and is presented well. The executive summary is well written and could stand alone; it captures the main recommendations, though these could be listed in full.	The executive summary of a report should contain the full list of recommendations of an evaluation.
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	Outstanding		Confident to Act	
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Outstanding			
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 of the necessary elements. It could stand alone, including the main recommendations, but its utility for decision-making would be enhanced by the full list of recommendations.		
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	Yes			
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	Yes			
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.	Almost			

Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	**The report is logically structured, clear and coherent. It reads and is presented well. The executive summary is well written and could stand alone; it captures the main recommendations, though these could be listed in full.**

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	The evaluation does successfully address the Terms of Reference; it could be more realistic about addressing some of the evaluation criteria e.g. impact.
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The participatory approach is a model of good practice including the process to develop the recommendations.

iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	There is a good discussion of the context and the issues around child protection in Romania.

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	The report has credibility other than its over-ambitious addressing of some of the evaluation criteria (notably coherence, connectedness and impact). The methodology is well described, the evidence against those criteria which are relevant is sound (though much weaker on the less relevant ones), the analysis is clear and the recommendations well developed.	**Almost Confident to Act** — The evaluation report has credibility other than the findings section, which presents an understandably weak evidence base against criteria which are arguably inapplicable to the object (connectedness, coherence and impact). The methodology is sound and well-described, the evidence base and analysis are sound at times, and the recommendations have been developed through a very robust process. Overall, the report is almost - but not quite - credible, constrained only by limited evidence against some of the criteria.
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'.	Yes	The report is logically sequenced and has a clear narrative thread.	
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	The ToRs do ask for evidence about impact and sustainability but are realistic about the fact that this might not be available - the evaluation team could therefore have defended a lack of evidence available to respond to these questions.	
	Other		
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	With a little more work this report could be used in confidence. The evaluation report has credibility other than the findings section, which presents an understandably weak evidence base against criteria which are arguably inapplicable to the object (connectedness, coherence and impact). The methodology is sound and well-described, the evidence base and analysis are sound at times, and the recommendations have been developed through a very robust process. Overall, the report is almost - but not quite - credible, constrained only by limited evidence against some of the criteria.		