



UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Almost	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding/ Very Confident to Act	Good/ Confident to Act	Almost satisfactory / Almost Confident to Act	Unsatisfactory/ Not Confident to Act	

The key questions are highlighted as shown here, and are important questions in guiding the analysis of the section

The Cornerstone questions are in column J and are questions that need to be answered for rating and justification of each of the six sections

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	Children and the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami: evaluation of UNICEF's response in Sri Lanka (2005-2008) - Country Synthesis Report				
Report sequence number	2009/001	Date of Review	24/11/2010	Year of the Evaluation Report	2009
Region	South Asia Regional Office			Country(ies)	Sri Lanka
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>	1.2 National: The programme covers the whole country, and the evaluation draws a sample in every district, or uses a sampling frame that is representative of the whole country.				The evaluation was part of a process also covering Indonesia, Thailand and Maldives. The reports follow a similar template (except Thailand).
Management <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.				Evaluation managed by UNICEF Evaluation Office.
Purpose <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>	3.2 At scale: The evaluation examines the efficacy of a programme that is being implemented at or near its maximum intended extent, with the intention of providing feedback on efficiency and the overall effectiveness of the programme at scale				The last of a range of evaluative exercises following the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. Drawing on 4 sectoral evaluations, it provides findings on country programme performance, though this is not the primary objective of the 4 reports from which this one is a synthesis.
	3.5 Humanitarian: Humanitarian evaluation assesses organizational performance in emergency settings (including both natural disasters & conflicts) at various phases of these crises, from preparedness and risk reduction to response, recovery & the transition to development				
	3.8 Country Programme Evaluation (CPE): An evaluation that assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of the entire UNICEF Country Programme				
Result <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>	4.3 Impact: Final results of a programme or policy on the intended beneficiaries and, where possible, on comparison groups. Reflects the cumulative effect of donor supported programmes of cooperation and national policy initiatives.				Meant as a contribution "towards impact evaluation", the report attempts to dissect UNICEF's response and the outcomes it achieved.
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>	5.2 Multi-sectoral: Addresses issues in two or more MTSP focus areas				The evaluation is a synthesis of 4 sector evaluations addressing the sectors where UNICEF was active in its tsunami response in Sri Lanka: WASH, education, protection, health. It also considers cross-cutting issues (HRBAP, gender, etc). The evaluation also includes a broader consideration of UNICEF's organisational performance throughout the response period.
	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.				
	5.4 Organizational performance: Evaluation of institutional effectiveness in operational areas, including supply, information technology, human resources, and finance. Also includes the more general issue of overall quality of UNICEF planning and implementation				
Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.3 Independent external: The evaluation is implemented by external consultants and/or UNICEF Evaluation Office professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies outside the division whose work is being evaluated.				The evaluation was managed by UNICEF, but the reporting was carried out by teams of independent consultants.
Timing / Stage	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme				This report is a synthesis of 4 sector evaluations. It is NOT the report of a single evaluation exercise.

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION						
Question	cc	Remarks				
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	The report provides a detailed sector-by-sector description of UNICEF's response. In view of the long period covered and of the synthetic nature of the report, the data are appropriately high level.	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.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>		
2 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	Each sectoral evaluation provides a good description of the rationale for the interventions: pre-tsunami situation, impact of the tsunami, and response approach. The description is based on evidence and previous reports.				
3 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	Both the sectoral evaluations and the broader programme description take account of relevant aspects of the context, including the long-standing civil conflict, pre-tsunami situation, Sri Lanka government policy, UNICEF institutional capacity, etc.				
4 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	The key stakeholders in each sector are identified in detail, which is important in Sri Lanka where many organisations operate in fields of interest to UNICEF. There are brief indications of their role and of UNICEF's level of contribution (e.g. lead on WASH etc.).	Confident to Act	It is difficult to identify anything that could have improved the contextual and intervention logic description. If anything, it is perhaps the results chain description that is the weakest link in this otherwise very well articulated presentation of the intervention. A description of the "build back better" approach would perhaps have helped a better understanding of the successes and challenges identified later in the report.		
5 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	Yes					
6 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes					
7 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	As this is an outcome/impact evaluation the status of individual interventions is not mentioned, but broad patterns are identified.				
8 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	The contextual (including political and programmatic) information is useful to understanding the findings.				
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 report gives an excellent, succinct overview of the pre- and post-tsunami situation, covering both the key sectoral aspects of interest to UNICEF and the broader social, economic and political context. This is appropriate to give the reader a well-rounded understanding of the context, though the provision of additional details about the intervention logic would have enriched the understanding of the findings.					

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<p>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.</p>	Almost	The purpose of the report is generally clear: in short, to draw lessons for future similar interventions. The key objective (in effect, moving towards an impact evaluation) is also clear, as is the scope (the four sectors of UNICEF focus). However, the sectoral reviews that form the main body of the report (and the basis of its scope) do not fully capture the purpose: organisation-wide lessons are assumed to be identifiable through the four-sector evaluations which, in practice, is not always the case (see below). This blurs the purpose.	<p>B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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</p>	Yes			
<p>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)</p>	Almost			
<p>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></p>	Almost	The basis of the evaluation is clear: the first four OECD/DAC criteria are used in each of the sectoral evaluations, but the methodology does not explain why these have been selected and not the humanitarian ones (impact assessment is referred to, implicitly, as an objective of the evaluation). In the absence of the TORs, it is not clear which criteria they set out. One reason TORs are not supplied may be that this report is a synthesis of 4 sectoral evaluations, not an evaluation in its own right. As a result, the report does not stand alone.	<p>Confident to Act</p>	<p>It must be noted that the relative weaknesses identified in this section may be related, besides the fact that it is a synthesis of sectoral evaluations, to the fact that this report is part of a series - there may therefore have been less of a perceived need to justify evaluation criteria because the same criteria were used in other reports. Similarly the scope (drawing general lessons on the basis of four sectoral studies) was drawn from that of the other studies. However it could be useful in future to address two points more explicitly: (1) the inference from sector studies to institutional findings about UNICEF should be more clearly articulated; (2) the selection of evaluation criteria (and any exclusion) should be justified, if only by reference to methodological thinking set out in another document.</p>
<p>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.</p>	No	This explanation is not given. This is particularly regrettable because of the omission of the humanitarian criteria. The omission may be justified in view of the transition to development being studied, but this should be made explicit.		
<p>14 Did the evaluation design consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming? This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender</p>	Yes	HRBAP is covered as one of the cross-cutting issues (i.e. not in the sectoral reviews). This section is virtually identical in all the reports in this series.		
<p>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></p>	<p>The report's objective and scope are clear, as is its purpose. However, the latter would have gained in clarity if the report had more clearly addressed the logic of inferring lessons for UNICEF as an institution from four sectoral evaluations. These weaknesses, however, do not substantially affect the credibility of the report, partly because it is written in a way that deliberately facilitates comparisons with other country studies in the same series.</p>			

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

Question	cc	Remarks		
<p>15 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 brief methodology section is adequate considering the "high level" nature of this evaluation and the use of sector-specific earlier evaluations.	<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>16 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>	Yes	The report identifies impact as the key area of limitation due to lack of information. Other aspects are appropriately covered.		
<p>17 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>	Almost	There is little discussion of ethical issues, partly because this is a high-level evaluation, drawing a significant part of its information from earlier evaluation reports. However, the report gives insufficient details about the way interviews with beneficiaries have been conducted. While the report's authors are acknowledged experts aware of protection and ethical issues, the report fails explicitly to describe risks and mitigation approaches. However, this does not hamper the credibility of the report.		
<p>18 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>	Almost			
<p>19 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>	Yes	The report makes several references to M&E procedures in place in various sectors, implemented by the Government of Sri Lanka. It makes an appropriate use of these procedures. As a high-level synthesis, the report does not include a results chain or other logic model for each sector. However, the sector studies refer to policies and standards in the various sectors (e.g., Core Commitments for Children in Emergencies) as the basis to assess effectiveness.	<p>Confident to Act</p> <p>As set out in the synthesis report (and assuming all four sectoral reports had the same approach), the methodology is appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation. Methodological choices made were justified, bias was avoided and limitations were mitigated. One strong point of the evaluation which helped mitigate any methodological weakness is the wide range of information (previous reports, policy and project documents, etc.), as demonstrated in the annex on references and in footnotes. The only methodological concern not fully addressed is the balance between sector evaluations and an evaluation of UNICEF's overall programme and its institutional capacity in the country. The introduction suggests that the focus is on the latter, but the main body of the report is on the former (the sectoral reviews).</p>	<p>The methodology, while sound, was not described in much detail. There is no list of people consulted: this makes it difficult to see the extent of consultations held (though abundant reports about the views of stakeholders suggest that the list of people consulted must have been comprehensive). A list should obviously always be provided. As noted in the previous section, the brevity of the methodological information was probably related to the fact that this report is a synthesis and is part of a series: the authors may have assumed that the reader is uninterested in reading similar methodological information in each report. This may be sound thinking, but the ability of this report to stand alone is reduced somewhat. It would be advisable in future to ensure that synthesis reports should, like the evaluations they are based on, be fully stand-alone documents.</p>
<p>20 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>	Yes			
<p>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender & 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	The report considers the issue of human rights, particularly in sector reviews on education, protection and health. It also covers HRBAP in the cross-cutting issues section of the review. This is appropriate in the context of this particular review, which covers four sectors and several years, but the methodology does not specifically refer to human rights. On the other hand, gender issues are raised in each sector review, and children's rights are referred to (occasionally implicitly) in the reviews on education and protection. The report's approach therefore appropriately covers rights and gender issues.		
<p>22 Do the analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide adequate information on human rights (inc. women & child rights) aspects? The inclusion of human rights and 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.</p>	Almost			

<p>23 Is the methodology appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the scope? 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 & aspects of social exclusion, disparities & equity.</p>	Yes			
<p>24 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>	Yes	As mentioned above, the sector evaluations are based in part on contacts with stakeholders and in part on secondary information drawn from previous reports. These evaluation appropriately restrict interviews to UNICEF staff and government officials. Some meetings were also held with groups of beneficiaries. This level of involvement of stakeholders would be insufficient if the evaluation did not also rely on a body of previous in-depth evaluations. In the present context, a broader range of stakeholder liaison was not required.		
<p>25 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			
<p>26 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>	N/A	There is no counterfactual as such, partly because the report does not consider a single project. However the report discusses alternative ways of delivering results.		
<p>27 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>	Almost	The evaluation responds to the purpose adequately. However, it remains unclear whether the purpose is mainly sectoral or institutional evaluation.		
<p>28 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>	Yes	Some limitations are identified, appropriately (mainly information on impact). However, the sector reviews effectively mitigate this through interviews, group meetings and desk study. The result is a well-rounded report, with no suggestion of particular bias.		
<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 methodology is sound and appropriately implemented, though somewhat succinct. Rights and gender issues were correctly covered, despite the relative lack of reference to these issues in the methodology. Overall, the methodology provides a sound basis for the report, taking into account the fact that this is a synthesis of four sectoral evaluations.</p>			

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<p>29 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.</p>	Yes	In keeping with the high-level nature of the evaluation, the findings focus on the results/outcomes level rather than on activities or outputs. The findings, though concise, are informative and well-grounded in the evidence base.	<p>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>30 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.</p>	Yes	The findings address each of the first four OECD/DAC criteria, and add a reasonable attempt at assessing impact. Evaluation questions are not specified, but the findings under each criterion cover the expected scope (despite some repetition of findings under different criteria). The evaluators were able to answer virtually all questions, though they did note that records were not complete in some areas (such as M&E of some sector activities).		
<p>31 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.</p>	Yes			
<p>32 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.</p>	Yes			
<p>33 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.</p>	N/A	There were no unexpected findings, partly because of the nature of this report, which synthesises previous reviews. The cost analysis remain at the level of the overall programme (the sectoral sections do not cover costs).		
<p>34 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.</p>	Almost			
<p>35 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.</p>	Yes	The report focuses on UNICEF's contribution, but it does refer appropriately to that of other stakeholders, particularly in view of the fact that much rebuilding work was done through other UN agencies, NGOs and government departments, whose contribution is briefly mentioned. The breadth of written sources referred to suggests that the authors have been able to avoid bias.		
<p>36 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.</p>	Yes			
<p>37 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>	Yes	The report systematically highlights reasons for positive and negative outcomes, often noting issues of institutional capacity, availability of expertise, etc.		

Confident to Act

As indicated nearby, the report could have been stronger, and perhaps more relevant to high-level decision makers, if it had devoted more space to identifying cross-sectoral patterns that affected UNICEF's response to the Tsunami.

<p>38 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>	Yes	The issue of sustainability is discussed in each sectoral review and in the cross-cutting section - partly in terms of cost implications, but mostly in terms of institutional capacity.			
<p>39 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>	Yes	The conclusions are balanced and clearly articulated. In each sectoral review, conclusion are draw on UNICEF's contribution and lessons are drawn. The conclusions chapter itself reviews each sector and adds a synthetic, cross-sectoral view of UNICEF's contribution and challenges, which adds value to the report.			
<p>40 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>	Yes				
<p>41 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>	Yes	The conclusions are relevant to the range of intended readers (UNICEF managers and counterparts in other agencies involved in disaster response). Conclusions go beyond the role of UNICEF alone and are useful to other actors as well, including the government.			
<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>The findings and conclusions are comprehensive and very clearly set out. They are balanced, not shying away from criticism, and are presented in non-judgemental, constructive language. This makes for reliable, credible conclusions, useful to managers at UNICEF and presumably also their counterparts in other agencies involved in emergency response, recovery and development. However, the relevance of the report would have been enhanced further by a more detailed assessment of UNICEF's institutional strengths and weaknesses as illustrated by its response in Sri Lanka.</p>				

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<p>42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.</p>	Yes	The recommendations are sensible and consistent with the findings and conclusions.	<p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object</p>	Yes	The recommendations are very appropriate to each of the sector evaluations. There is also a body of recommendations relevant to UNICEF as a whole, which are also appropriate though they are presented in a less convenient way (some in a specific section, some under sectoral recommendations). The recommendations are not prioritised.		
<p>44 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.</p>	Almost			
<p>45 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.</p>	Yes	The general recommendations are directed at UNICEF. The sectoral recommendations address specific targets (government, UNICEF in country and UNICEF global). While most recommendations are realistic and clearly address identified concerns, some involve policy decisions at global level, even though they concern work in Sri Lanka. Many recommendations are themselves ambitious programmes of action.	<p>Confident to Act</p>	<p>As indicated, some recommendations should have been expanded upon, primarily to explain better what outcome their implementation should lead to. There is also a presentation concern about the recommendations addressed to UNICEF as a whole: nine of these are presented together, but others are "buried" under each of the four sets of sectoral recommendations. This is unhelpful, particularly because some of the disparate recommendations could have been consolidated (such as all those dealing with human resources management). Future TORs should request both a prioritisation of the recommendations and a thematic grouping of those addressing similar issues across sectors.</p>
<p>46 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</p>	Almost			
<p>47 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.</p>	Almost	The report does not specifically set out how the recommendations were developed (in particular, no record of any discussions at drafting stage during the sector evaluations).		
<p>48 Where presented, 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.</p>	Yes	There is a specific section on lessons learned in each sectoral evaluation, setting out useful lessons that go beyond a restatement of findings, and suggest avenues for further strategic thinking.		
<p>49 Where presented, 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.</p>	Yes	The lessons identified are pitched at a general level, relevant to other emergency responses. However, they are very succinctly stated.		
<p>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></p>		<p>This synthesis report provides a wide range of relevant recommendations, focusing on each of the four sectors reviewed and on UNICEF institutional development and policies. The recommendations are not prioritised, which is partly justified by the aim of enhancing preparedness for future emergencies. While many recommendations are actionable in the relatively short term, those that imply policy changes (e.g. on human resources management) are effectively programmes of action that can only be implemented in the medium term. Despite some presentation issues, the recommendations are credible and well grounded in the evidence provided.</p>		

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?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
50. 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	All elements included.	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.	The key structural weaknesses identified in this section are surprising, as the report preparation has been overseen by the UNICEF Evaluation Office. In mitigation it can be said that the report was probably never intended to stand fully alone, as it is a synthesis and part of a series. Future reports should be designed to stand alone, even if their are a synthesis of earlier ones and planned as part of a series: this ensures that they remain relevant later, if/when they are consulted individually.
51. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A	Yes	Yes, executive summary is provided.	Confident to Act The report is well structured, the logic is clear and the progression to conclusion is easy to follow. The report also follows the same structure as the other reports in the series (on the Maldives, Thailand and Indonesia), which obviously helps comparisons. The only concern with structure (other than confusion between lessons and recommendations in the executive summary and missing annexes) is that the report lacks a dedicated chapter providing a synthesis of findings at the institutional UNICEF level. This is largely connected to the lack of clarity mentioned above, as to the purpose of the report: is it only a synthesis of four sectoral reviews or is it also an attempt to evaluate the performance of UNICEF as a whole in the country? In practice it is a bit of both, weighted towards the former.	
52 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	The executive summary is well written and clear, though it does not include the main recommendations. In a somewhat confusing way, the "lessons" listed in the executive summary are written like recommendations ("UNICEF should..."). With that caveat, it is a good (though overlong) stand-alone overview of the synthesis report, which would be helpful to decision makers.		
53 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			
54 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			
55 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes	The report's structure is very clear and helpful. Chapter headings make sense, and they are divided in clear sections and subsections.		
56 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	No	Unfortunately the annexes lack key elements: TORs and list of interviewees. The only annex is a useful list of documents consulted, but it does not list the 4 sectoral evaluations of which the report is a synthesis.		
57 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Almost			
58 Is the style of the report human rights compliant? This 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 is clearly written by expert well versed in human rights and in evaluation. Sensitivity is appropriately exercised in substance and tone.		
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 clarity and coherence of the report's structure contributes to its credibility and effectiveness as a support for decision-making. Notwithstanding formal problems (recommendations not reproduced in the executive summary, etc) the report conveys its messages effectively, partly because it is well and concisely written.			

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 TORs are not appended. However, assuming the four sectoral evaluations had similar TORs to those of another report in the series (on Thailand), the TORs were indeed fulfilled. The Thailand TORs themselves were not fully well written, because they placed evaluation criteria (relevance, etc) and questions (on capacity development, partnerships, etc) on the same level - see the review of the Thailand report 2009/007. Despite this, the report is effective in conveying clear and relevant conclusions and recommendations.		
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The principle of doing similar evaluations in a range of countries seems in itself to be good practice.		
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	The report identifies the Child-Friendly Schools approach as an effective and good practice. However, there is no suggestion that this is specific to this country context. Other reports in the series make similar remarks.		
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?	Yes	The six sections of this review are satisfactory and contribute to the report's credibility and effectiveness as a decision-making aid. Although some sections are weaker than others, the identified weaknesses do not substantially affect the grading.	Confident to Act The report is one of a series of country-focused tsunami-related evaluation syntheses, all following a similar template. This report is strongly grounded in evidence and well articulated. The sectoral evaluations are sensible and provide useful insights in the policy, strategic and practical aspects of recovery and transition to development. A strategic manager would probably like to see more details on the overall programmatic and strategic contribution of UNICEF, and on the institutional development challenges it faces in Sri Lanka. This aspect, though covered to some extent, should perhaps have been given more prominence - it is all the more regrettable that it wasn't because much of the relevant information is already scattered in the report (for example, the sectoral evaluations identified human resources management as a challenge, but this issue is not considered in detail in the overall synthesis). Related weaknesses, mentioned in other sections, concern the ambiguity of the evaluation's purpose (collection of sectoral studies, or strategic synthesis) and the lack of prioritisation of recommendations. However, the reports remains highly credible and forms a good basis for decision-making.
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	There is no concern about the logic of the report's progress from factual background to 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.		The report is a synthesis and part of a series. This review should therefore also be read in conjunction with those of the other country reports.	
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>	This report can be used with confidence. A generally excellent synthesis report, which marshals an impressive amount of information to provide a high-level, strategic evaluation of UNICEF's response to the Tsunami and its aftermath, including the transition to development. Well grounded in sectoral studies, the report clearly benefits from the expertise of its authors and the rigour of their analysis. If anything, one may regret that insufficient space was devoted to a review of UNICEF's overall performance in Sri Lanka. However this weakness does not seriously limit the value of the report as an aid to strategic decision-making.		