UNICEF Global Oversight Evaluation Report System (GOERS) 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 Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Maldives (2005-2008) - Country Synthesis Report

Report sequence number	2009/001	Date of Review	28/11/2010	Year of the Evaluation Report	2009
Region	East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office			Country(ies)	Indonesia, Maldives, Sri Lanka
Type of Report	Evaluation			TORs Present	No
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC				

Classification of Evaluation Report		Comments
Geographical (*Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings*)	1.5 Multi-region/Global: The programme is implemented in two or more regions, or deliberately targets all regions. The evaluation would typically sample several countries across multiple regions, with the results intended to be generalizable in two or more regions.	This is a "synthesis of syntheses" covering 3 countries in 2 UNICEF regions (SARO and EAPRO). Similar study on Thailand not included.
Management (*Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions*)	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 (*Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'etre*)	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 report is a synthesis of 3 national synthesis reports drawing on 4 sectoral evaluations. It

(etc)	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	*sectoral evaluations. It* seeks to draw out common patterns of findings and country programme performance across the 3 countries, to help develop lessons for future similar emergency responses.
	3.8 Country Programme Evaluation (CPE): An evaluation that assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of the entire UNICEF Country Programme	
Result *(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)*	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 an evaluation of "outcomes and impact", the report attempts to dissect UNICEF's response and the results it achieved.
MTSP Correspondence *(Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights)*	5.2 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 Indonesia, the Maldives and Sri Lanka: WASH, education, protection, health. It also considers cross-cutting issues (HRBAP, gender, conflict, 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 *(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)*	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 3 country-based syntheses, each covering 4 sector evaluations.

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

Question	cc	Remarks	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
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 an overview of activities in 4 key sectors in 3 countries over 4 years. It is "high-level" by nature. Given this constraint, the description is as detailed as can be reasonably expected.	**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** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	The sectoral evaluation section provides a good description of the rationale for the interventions in each country (pre-tsunami situation, impact of the tsunami, and response), based on the country synthesis 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	The sectoral evaluations and the broader programme description take account of relevant aspects of the context, including conflict where relevant, pre-tsunami situation, 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 at a level of detail consistent with the high level nature of the report. There are brief indications of	dent to Act	This is a "synthesis of syntheses": by nature, it goes into less contextual and descriptive detail than a standard evaluation would.	It is difficult to identify anything that could have improved the contextual and intervention logic

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	their role and more detailed ones of UNICEF's level of contribution (e.g., lead on WASH, etc.).	**Conf** However, the report provides a clear description of the context of the interventions, including an overview of the pre- and post-tsunami situation in each sector, and a description of relevant policy, political and social elements of context. The impact of the conflicts in Aceh and northern Sri Lanka is mentioned where appropriate to the context. The organisational context is also adequately described. It may be argued that the information given does not amount to a results chain, in the sense that, in each sectoral case, the context and the intervention logic are described fairly succinctly. The level of detail is consistent with the nature of the report and gives a fair image of the situation and intervention.	description. It is essential to note that this is not a stand-alone evaluation. Instead, it is a synthesis of country reports that are themselves syntheses of sector evaluations. By design, this report focuses more on setting out cross-cutting findings and conclusions than on underlying evidence. In the present review, the "synthesis of syntheses" nature of the report is taken into account without being reiterated each time.
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 information (including political and programmatic) 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. *Up to two sentences*	This "synthesis of syntheses" 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 (or conflict) context in which UNICEF operated, in the 3 countries reviewed. This is appropriate to give the reader a well-rounded understanding of the interventions. By nature, this is a report focused on setting out broad findings, conclusions and recommendations: in that sense, it is not a stand-alone report, it is based on country-specific sector evaluations.			

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Question	cc	Remarks	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
9 Is the purpose of the evaluation clear? This includes why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used.	Yes	The purpose of the 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.	**B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?** The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Yes			
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Almost			

12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Almost	The basis of the evaluation is clear: the first four OECD/DAC criteria are referred to in the methodology, although they are not systematically used in each of the country and sectoral summaries. There are no TORs appended, probably because this is not a stand-alone evaluation. The reader might assume that the criteria are set in the original country and sector evaluation TORs, but this is not made explicit.	Confident to Act	The purpose of the evaluation is generally clear, including in terms of timing and target audience. The scope and objectives are also clear: to draw from sector evaluations in specific countries, and outline conclusions valid across the countries and the sectors. In effect, the report does this by editing into one report the three country synthesis reports (which themselves stitched 4 sector evaluations together). The information is cogently used and builds a reasonably holistic picture. However there is a risk that the objective and scope of the original evaluations are not fully appropriate to a "synthesis of syntheses" and that bias could be introduced in this process, if issues identified at country level are given a "cross-regional" significance that they may not deserve.	In a synthesis report like this there is a need to identify any specific limitations related to its nature as a "synthesis of syntheses" in terms of objective and scope of the evaluation.
13 Does the evaluation explain why the evaluation criteria were chosen and/or any standard DAC evaluation criteria (above) rejected? The rationale for using each particular criterion and rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	Almost	There is no explanation of the criteria selection. While this is not good practice, it can be explained by the "synthesis of syntheses" nature of this report.			
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	Yes	HRBAP is covered as one of the cross-cutting issues, in a section that reproduces the relevant text of each country synthesis report.			
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The report's objective and scope are clear, as is its purpose. It largely edits together 3 country synthesis reports, which are themselves compilations of 4 sector evaluations. This process helps in highlighting key issues and to build a holistic picture of UNICEF's overall response to the Tsunami. However, there is a risk that the objective and scope of the original evaluations are not fully appropriate to a "synthesis of syntheses" and lead to the introduction of bias.				

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

Question	cc	Remarks		
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.	Yes	The brief methodology section is adequate considering the synthetic nature of this report and its reliance on other evaluations reports.	**C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?** The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes. The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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	Yes	The report identifies "inconsistencies and capacity constraints in data collection" as limitations. Appropriate mitigation is proposed.		
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	Almost	There is little discussion of ethical issues, partly because this is a high-level evaluation, drawing its information from earlier evaluation reports. The report fails explicitly to describe ethical risks and mitigation approaches. However, there is a clear awareness of risks faced by children as a result of conflict, domestic and social violence, etc.		
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	Yes			
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.	Yes	The report makes several references to M&E procedures, particularly those put in place during the period of the evaluation, in the 3 countries. It also notes countries and sectors in which M&E is inadequate. As a high-level	Not Confident to Act	The report calls itself an evaluation, suggesting it is a conventional, single evaluative exercise that the synthesis merely summarises. In practice, however, it is not: it is a synthesis of 12 individual evaluations (4 per	To address the risk of bias resulting from the "synthesis of syntheses" process, future similar exercises should ensure that the country synthesis and multi-country synthesis

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.	Yes	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 (including Core Commitments for Children in Emergencies) as a basis to assess effectiveness.	Almost	sector in 3 countries), mediated through 3 country syntheses. The 12 sector evaluations have their methodology, with acknowledged differences. While the sector evaluations provide the "synthesis of syntheses" with a good evidence base, no explicit methodology is proposed for the synthesis process itself. To some extent the synthesis merely juxtaposes findings from the 12 evaluations. However by doing so there is a risk of subjectivity in the presentation of findings and conclusions, which is not mitigated because it is not addressed as such or as a limitation. This issue was already highlighted in the review of the country synthesis reports on Maldives and Sri Lanka. But whereas the move from 4 sector evaluation to a country synthesis did not appear to hamper the credibility of the synthesis, the additional step of "synthesis of 3 country syntheses" may cause bias and distortions. The findings may not be sufficiently
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.	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. This is appropriate in the context of this particular review, 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.		stages are explicitly designed into the objectives of the initial sector evaluations. This should help develop methodologies that take cross-sectoral and cross-country comparisons into account at evaluation design stage.
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.	Almost			

				may not be sufficiently reliable for stakeholders to act on them with full confidence, hence the concern expressed here.
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.	Yes			
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.	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 evaluations 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.		
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.	Yes			
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.	Almost	There is no counterfactual as such. However, the report discusses and sometimes recommends alternative ways of delivering results (e.g., outsourcing construction, etc.).		

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.	Almost	The methodology was designed for sector evaluations, not a multi-country synthesis. The methodology is not fully satisfactory (see answer to question C).		
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	Almost	The methodological limitations acknowledged in the report do not encompass a more basic question: how to avoid bias when moving from sectoral evaluations in 3 countries to general findings on organisational performance?		
Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	There is no methodology for synthesizing the country/sector level evaluations as done in the report. The original methodology of the 4 sector evaluations in 3 countries is not fully appropriate as a methodology for a "synthesis of syntheses" as it does not provide for the synthesis process itself. The risk of bias resulting from this process is not fully addressed in the report.			

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
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.	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.	**D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?** Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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.	Yes	The findings address each of the first 4 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.		
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.	Yes		**Confident to Act** The findings are very well articulated in each sectoral review 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 (looking at UNICEF's overall contribution in Sri Lanka) are	
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.	Yes			
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.	N/A	There were no unexpected findings, partly because of the nature of this report, which synthesises previous reviews		

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.	Almost	synthesises previous reviews. The cost analysis remain at the level of the overall programme (the sectoral sections do not address costs).	contribution in Sri Lanka) are sensible and provide added value. However the overall findings and conclusions do remain a bit too focused on the sectoral aspects - the reader develops a sense that not all the cross-sectoral patterns (relevant to assessing UNICEF's overall contribution) have been identified. In particular, the report hints at issues of human resources management (such as ensuring the durable presence of relevant experts throughout the relief and recovery phases) that could have been expanded upon in the conclusion. This concern, however, does not substantially affect the validity of the findings and conclusions.
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.	Yes		
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.	Yes		
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. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Yes	The report systematically highlights reasons for positive and negative outcomes, often noting issues of institutional capacity, availability of expertise, conflict context, etc.	
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.	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.	

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.	Yes	The conclusions are balanced and clearly articulated. In each sectoral review, conclusions draw on UNICEF's contribution and lessons are identified. 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.	
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.	Yes		
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).	Yes	The conclusions are relevant to the range of stakeholders (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 government.	
Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The findings and conclusions are comprehensive and 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.		

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks		Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
42 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Yes	The recommendations are sensible and consistent with the findings and conclusions.	**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.	
43 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes	The recommendations are 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.		
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.	Almost			
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.	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.	**Confident to Act**	The recommendations are relevant and consistent with the findings and conclusion. They also offer realistic answers to challenges encountered in implementing activities. There is a lack of prioritisation, which concerns both the 9 institution-level recommendations, and those concerning each sector (about 10 per sector). The failure to prioritise may be justified in part by the fact that the recommendations are aimed at changing procedures to deal with future emergencies. Another weakness of the recommendations is that, while some address specific
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	Almost			

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.	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).	action modalities, others involve significant policy changes (such as those related to human resources, the supervision of construction programmes, etc.). While the report cannot be expected to go into much detail about the way its recommendations should be implemented, it lacks detail about what some of the specific recommendations should achieve. Despite these reservations, it remains possible to act confidently on the basis of this report, because the recommendations are properly evidence-based.
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.	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.	
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.	Yes	The lessons identified are pitched at a general level, relevant to other emergency responses. However, they are very succinctly stated.	
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	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.		

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	Constructive feedback for future reports Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice
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 basic elements are included.		
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	An executive summary is included in the evaluation report.	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 a only 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.	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.
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 reasonable (though overlong) overview of the synthesis report, which would be of limited use 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	Almost			
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.	Almost			
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.		

Confident to Act

56 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? 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	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. *Up to two sentences*	**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 4 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 on the same plane evaluation criteria (relevance, etc) and questions (on capacity development, partnerships, etc) - 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 — 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. The overall programmatic and strategic contribution of UNICEF, and the institutional development challenges it faces could have been more pronounced (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

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.	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.
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. *Up to two sentences*	**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. The reports is highly credible and forms a good basis for decision-making.**