



## UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

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

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

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

<a href="#">UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System</a>	<a href="#">UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards</a>
--	--	---

Response	
<b>Title of the Evaluation Report</b>	<b>Children and the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami: evaluation of UNICEF's response in Thailand (2005-2008)</b>
<b>Report sequence number</b>	2009/007
<b>Date of Review</b>	20/11/2010
<b>Year of the Evaluation Report</b>	2009
<b>Region</b>	East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Thailand
<b>Type of Report</b>	Evaluation
<b>TORs Present</b>	Yes
<b>Name of reviewer</b>	IOD PARC
Classification of Evaluation Report	
Geographical <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated &amp; generalizability of evaluation findings)</i>	Comments
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, Sri Lanka and the Maldives. However this report follows a different template.
<b>Management</b> <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.
<b>Purpose</b> <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'etre)</i>	3.2 At scale: The evaluation examines the efficacy of a programme that is being implemented at or near its maximum intended extent, with the intention of providing feedback on efficiency and the overall effectiveness of the programme at scale
	3.5 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
<b>Result</b> <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.
<b>MTSP Correspondence</b> <i>(Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights)</i>	5.2 Multi-sectoral: Addresses issues in two or more MTSP focus areas
	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
<b>Level of Independence</b> <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.
<b>Timing / Stage</b>	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

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<b>1 Is the object of the evaluation well described?</b> This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Yes	The report provides a detailed sector-level description of UNICEF's response, built around the "build back better" strategy. In view of the long period covered the data are at appropriately high level, and provide useful background.		<b>A/ Does the report present a clear &amp; full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</b> The report should describe the object of the evaluation including the results chain, meaning the 'theory of change' that underlies the programme being evaluated. This theory of change includes what the programme was meant to achieve and the pathway (chain of results) through which it was expected to achieve this. The context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object should be described. For example, the partner government's strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency's corporate goals & priorities, as appropriate.
<b>2 Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</b> The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	Yes	The evaluation provides a good description of the rationale for the interventions: pre-tsunami situation, impact of the tsunami, and response. The connection between pre- and post-tsunami programming is made clear.		
<b>3 Is the context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated?</b> The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Yes	The section on the impact of the tsunami gives adequate contextual information on the socio-economic situation and the main strategic directions taken by UNICEF.		
<b>4 Are key stakeholders clearly identified?</b> These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Yes	The key stakeholders in each sector are identified in adequate detail. There are brief indications of their role and of UNICEF's level of contribution, though the report focuses on UNICEF. In some cases (e.g. Care re: protection), the input of specific actors is indicated. Details about UNICEF's activities are backed by a clear timeline.	Confident to Act	The report provides a clear description of the context of the intervention, including an overview of the pre- and post-tsunami situation in each sector, and a description of relevant involvement by other stakeholders. The organisational context is also adequately described. The focus on "build back better" effectively provides a guiding thread, which amounts to a results chain. The level of detail is consistent with the objective of the evaluation, and gives a fair image of the situation and intervention.
<b>5 Are key stakeholders' contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Yes			
<b>6 Are UNICEF contributions described?</b> This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
<b>7 Is the implementation status described?</b> This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Yes	As this is essentially an impact evaluation, the status of individual interventions is not mentioned, but broad patterns are identified.		
<b>8 Does this illuminate findings?</b> The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Yes	The contextual information (including timeline and programmes) is useful to understanding the findings.		<b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<b>Executive Feedback on Section A</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The report provides a detailed programme-level description of UNICEF's response, built around the "build back better" concept, which provides a thread throughout the evaluation, clarifying the intervention logic. Moreover, 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 is provided. This informs the understanding of the findings presented.</b>			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<p><b>9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear?</b> This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.</p>	Yes	<p>The purpose of the report is generally clear: in short, to draw lessons for future similar interventions. The key objectives from the TORs are set out in the report, as is the scope (key sectors of UNICEF activities). Objectives and scope are clearly related to the purpose of the evaluation.</p>	<p><b>B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b> The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b> This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details</p>	Yes			
<p><b>11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose?</b> The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)</p>	Yes			
<p><b>12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose?</b> It is imperative to make the basis of the value 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>	Yes	<p>The TORs refer to the entire range of OECD/DAC criteria, which are effectively addressed in the report. In addition, some cross-cutting issues such as rights-based approach are also highlighted in the TORs. Some of the standard DAC criteria are broader than expected: for example the sustainability criterion is meant under the TORs to also cover replicability. Overall, this makes for an ambitious, but clear and appropriate, set of evaluation criteria.</p>	<p><b>Confident to Act</b></p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation is clear, including in terms of timing and target audience and objectives and scope are clearly set out. The evaluation TORs are clearly formulated, refer to all the standard OECD/DAC criteria, and are appropriately reflected in the TORs. Overall, the logic of the evaluation is clearly set out, and the rationale and approach described in the report are followed throughout.</p>	<p>This report has different (and better) TORs and evaluation logic than the synthesis reports concerning the other tsunami-affected countries. It makes direct comparisons between the countries difficult. Future evaluations of this kind (looking at country-level responses to a regional event) would better be built around a common template to ensure comparability (although this may not always be practically possible).</p>
<p><b>13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected?</b> The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.</p>	Yes	<p>The report contains appropriate references to the TORs, which set out adequate evaluative questions explaining the use of the criteria. None of the standard DAC Evaluation criteria is rejected.</p>		
<p><b>14 Did the evaluation design consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming?</b> 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	<p>HRBAP is covered as one of the cross-cutting issues. Human rights are also covered under other evaluation questions (e.g., on disparity reduction and gender). This issue is mainstreamed throughout the report.</p>		
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section B</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>As set out in the TORs the report's objective and scope are clear, as is its purpose. The evaluative questions set out in the TORs provide additional guidance that is appropriately used in the evaluation report.</b></p>			

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

Question	cc	Remarks		
<p><b>15 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks?</b> This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.</p>	Yes	The brief methodology section is appropriate and complements the guidance given in the TORs. An evaluation matrix is annexed.	<p><b>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</b></p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>16 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations?</b> This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy &amp; overcome data limits</p>	Almost	The report's introduction gives a brief overview of data sources, limitations are not explicitly addressed but are mentioned where relevant in the report.		
<p><b>17 Are ethical issues and considerations described?</b> The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done</p>	Almost	There is no discussion of ethical issues as such, although protection is covered as a matter of course. There is no reference to ethical safeguards in the report or in the TORs. However, it must be said that this report was not primarily based on information from beneficiaries, as its focus was on institutional issues. The lack of ethical issues coverage can therefore be explained in part by the relatively marginal interaction with beneficiaries in this evaluation.		
<p><b>18 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described?</b> When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors</p>	Almost			
<p><b>19 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed?</b> The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&amp;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 Thailand. 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><b>Confident to Act</b></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 consulted (including previous reports, policy and project documents, etc.), as demonstrated in the annex on references and in footnotes. The use of the "build back better" strategy as a cross-sectoral common thread throughout the report ensures that the sector overviews come together into an effective programme- and strategic-level evaluation.</p>	<p>This is an excellent report in terms of methodology. Methodological descriptions are succinct (a few pages in the report and in an annex) but they evaluators have clearly stuck to a consistent approach and have made excellent use of the information available. Human rights issues are fully mainstreamed and addressed in a focused way where relevant.</p>
<p><b>20 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&amp;E framework of the evaluated object?</b> In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender &amp; child rights) frameworks?</b> UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.</p>	Almost	The report considers the full range of relevant human rights issues, particularly in relation to education, protection and health. It also covers HRBAP in the cross-cutting issues section of the report. This is appropriate in the context of this particular evaluation, which covers 4 sectors and a period of several years, though the methodology does not specifically refer to human rights. The report's approach therefore appropriately covers rights and gender issues.		
<p><b>22 Do the analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations &amp; lessons provide adequate information on human rights (inc. women &amp; child rights) aspects?</b> 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>	Yes			

<p><b>23 Is the methodology appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the scope?</b> If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying &amp; structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations &amp; aspects of social exclusion, disparities &amp; equity.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>24 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described?</b> This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.</p>	Yes	The evaluation is based in part on contacts with beneficiaries and, in larger part, on information drawn from implementers, staff and other stakeholders, as well as previous reports. This level of involvement of beneficiaries 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 - also because the focus on the evaluation was at the programming and institutional level.		
<p><b>25 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand?</b> The breadth &amp; degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible &amp; preferable.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>26 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual?</b> The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p>	N/A	There is no counterfactual as such; the report notes this as a limitation (under effectiveness). However, this does not hamper the relevance of the report.		
<p><b>27 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation?</b> The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Yes	The evaluation methodology responds to the purpose in a thorough manner.		
<p><b>28 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand?</b> Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings</p>	Yes	Some limitations are identified, appropriately (mainly information on impact). However, the report effectively mitigates this through triangulation with a range of sources. The result is a well-rounded report, with no suggestion of particular bias.		
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section C</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>The methodology is sound and appropriately implemented, though the description provided is 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.</b></p>			

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
<p><b>29 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</b> Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.</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><b>Confident to Act</b></p> <p>The findings are very well articulated and comprehensively address issues raised in the contextual and other factual descriptions. Although they occasionally present genuine criticism, they are written in non-judgemental language and are well grounded in evidence. Similarly, the findings at the cross-cutting and institutional levels are sensible and provide added value. The report clearly distinguishes between findings and examples of good practices, and attempts to identify elements that can be replicated. The conclusions are also clearly set out, highlighting relevant lessons learned and are directly connected with evidence.</p>	
<p><b>30 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</b> The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</p>	Yes	The findings address each of the OECD/DAC criteria. Evaluation questions in the TOR and annexed matrix are appropriate, and the findings under each criterion cover the expected scope. 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><b>31 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</b> There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>32 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</b> The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>33 Are unexpected findings discussed?</b> If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</p>	N/A	The findings probably include some unexpected ones, but they are all clearly based in evidence. The cost analysis remains at the level of the overall programme. The sectoral descriptions only make passing references to costs, and the report explicitly refrains from assessing the "allocative efficiency" of UNICEF's programming, meaning that it did not explore alternative ways of implementing the programme.		
<p><b>34 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</b> Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.</p>	Almost			
<p><b>35 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders?</b> For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.</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 contributions are briefly mentioned. The breadth of written sources referred to suggests that the authors have been able to avoid bias.		
<p><b>36 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders?</b> As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>37 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible?</b> These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Yes	The report systematically highlights reasons for positive and negative outcomes, often noting issues of institutional capacity, availability of expertise, etc.		

<p><b>38 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed?</b> The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	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><b>39 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object?</b> Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	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><b>40 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings?</b> Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>41 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation?</b> Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).</p>	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><b>Executive Feedback on Section D</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>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 could have been enhanced further by a more detailed assessment of UNICEF's institutional strengths and weaknesses.</b></p>			

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
<p><b>42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported?</b> 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><b>E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?</b> Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.</p>	<p><b>Constructive feedback for future reports</b> <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p><b>43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation?</b> Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object</p>	Yes	The recommendations are addressed to specific stakeholders. There is also a body of recommendations relevant to UNICEF as a whole, which are also appropriate. The recommendations are prioritised by reducing the number of recommendations addressed to each stakeholder.		
<p><b>44 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised?</b> If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.</p>	Yes			
<p><b>45 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action?</b> Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.</p>	Yes	The recommendations are clearly addressed to specific stakeholders. They address in a synthetic manner each of the concerns highlighted in the report. They appear to be achievable.		
<p><b>46 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation?</b> This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes</p>	Yes			
<p><b>47 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations?</b> The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.</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><b>48 Where presented, are lessons learned correctly identified?</b> Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.</p>	Yes	There are specific highlights on lessons learned in the report, setting out useful lessons that go beyond a re-statement of findings, and suggest avenues for further strategic thinking.		
<p><b>49 Where presented, are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have?</b> Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.</p>	Yes	The lessons identified are pitched at a general level, relevant to other emergency responses. However, they are very succinctly stated.		
<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section E</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives &amp; negatives), &amp; justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p><b>The report provides appropriate, realistic and achievable recommendations. The recommendations are credible and well grounded in the evidence provided, though the report does not explicitly indicate whether they have been discussed with UNICEF and other stakeholders.</b></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>
<b>50. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements?</b> Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Yes	All basic elements are included.	<b>Confident to Act</b> 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, Sri Lanka and Indonesia), which obviously helps comparisons. The only concern with structure 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 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.	Future reports should be designed to stand alone, even if they are a synthesis of earlier evaluations and planned as part of a series: this ensures that they remain relevant later, if/when they are consulted individually.
<b>51. Is an executive summary included as part of the report?</b> If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A	Yes	Executive Summary is included.		
<b>52 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements?</b> Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	Almost	The executive summary is well written and clear. It is a good stand-alone overview of the report, which would be helpful to decision makers.		
<b>53 Can the executive summary stand alone?</b> It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Yes			
<b>54 Can the executive summary inform decision making?</b> It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Almost			
<b>55 Is the report logically structured?</b> 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.		
<b>56 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements?</b> Appropriate elements may include: ToR; 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	Yes	With the exception of information about the evaluators and information about the results chain (though documents on this are referred to), the annexes contain all appropriate elements and help enhance the credibility of the report.		
<b>57 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</b>	Yes			
<b>58 Is the style of the report human rights compliant?</b> 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.		
<b>Executive Feedback on Section F</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>The clarity and coherence of the report's structure contributes to its credibility and effectiveness as a support for decision-making. The report conveys its messages effectively, partly because it is well and concisely written.</b>			

Additional Information			
Question	Remarks		
<b>i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference?</b> If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section	Yes. The TORs are ambitious (wide range of evaluation criteria) but it is a credit to the evaluators that they managed to encompass all issues in a relatively tight report.		
<b>ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> In terms of evaluation	The principle of doing similar evaluations in a range of countries seems in itself to be good practice.		
<b>iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation</b> 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: $\Omega$ / Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? This question should be considered from the perspective of UNICEF strategic management.
<b>i/ To what extent does each of the six sections of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act?</b> Taken on their own, could a reasonable person have confidence in each of the five core evaluation elements separately? It is particularly important to consider: o Is the report methodologically appropriate? o Is the evidence sufficient, robust and authoritative? o Do the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations hold together?	Yes	The report is satisfactory under each section of the review. Indeed there is a case for considering this report as outstanding, because it so comprehensively and clearly addresses its TORs.	Very Confident to Act  This report is very good and should be obligatory reading for anyone at UNICEF involved in work on Thailand, and indeed in any programme/strategic management. The report achieves this by being consistently satisfactory in all aspects (except perhaps financial analysis). It offers a very powerful evidence base for its findings, and develops sound, constructive conclusions and recommendations.
<b>ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report?</b> The report should hold together not just as individually 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.	
<b>iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report?</b> This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.		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. However, it is significantly better than the other reports in the series.	
<b>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating</b> Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	<b>An outstanding 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. This report not only would help managers involved in work on Thailand, but should also be brought to the attention of any manager dealing with programme development and strategy-setting. Well grounded in sectoral studies, the report clearly benefits from the expertise of its authors and the rigour of their analysis. The report is highly credible and forms a good basis for decision-making.</b>		