EVALUATION ID	
	2690-2015/001

UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

Colour Coding	CC	Dark green	Green	Amber	Red	White
	Questions	Outstanding	Yes	Mostly Satisfactory	No	Not Applicable
	Section & Overall Rating	Outstanding, best practice	Highly Satisfactory	Mostly Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	

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	**Report on the Summative External Evaluation of the Catalytic Initiative (CI)/Integreated Health Systems Strengtheing (IHSS) Programme in Malawi**

Report sequence number	2015/001	Date of Review	16/10/2015	Year of the Evaluation Report	2015
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office			Country	Malawi
Type of Report	Evaluation			TORs Present	No
Name of reviewer	**Universalia Management Group**				

Classification of Evaluation Report		Comments
Geographic Scope (*Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings*)	1.1 Sub-national: The programme and evaluation covers selected sub-national units (districts, provinces, states, etc.) within a country, where results cannot be generalized to the whole country	
Management of Evaluation (*Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions*)	2.3 Joint managed, with organisations outside the UN system: UNICEF is the co-manager with one or more organizations outside the UN system	
Purpose (*Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être*)	3.7 Programme: An evaluation of a sectorial programme to determine its overall effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the stated goals and objectives	
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.	
SPOA Correspondence (*Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities: (1) Health; (2) HIV-AIDS; (3) WASH; (4) Nutrition; (5) Education; (6) Child Protection; (7) Social Inclusion; (8) Cross-Cutting - Gender Equality; and (9) Cross-cutting - Humanitarian Action)*)	5.1 Health: Supporting global efforts to reduce under-five mortality through improved and equitable use of high impact maternal, newborn and child health interventions from pregnancy to adolescence and promotion of healthy behaviours. Programme areas: a) Immunization b) Polio eradication c) Maternal and newborn health d) Child health e) Health systems strengthening f) Health in humanitarian situations	
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.	
Approach	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	A/ Does the report present a clear & full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
Object and context				
1 Is the object of the evaluation well described? This needs to include a clear description of the interventions (project, programme, policies, otherwise) to be evaluated including how the designer thought that it would address the problem identified, implementing modalities, other parameters including costs, relative importance in the organization and (number of) people reached.	Mostly	Sections 1.1-1.3 provide a concise, yet detailed summary of key characteristics of the programme context. The information does illuminate findings. Section 2 then provides a description of the object of the evaluation. It provides information on key programme interventions and their rationale. The section does, however, not contain information on costs/financial resources (neither of the multi-country CI/IHSS overall, nor the budget allocated to Malawi). Information on the programme timeline is incomplete (the section makes explicit reference to the first year of programme implementation, but does not comment on how this process evolved afterwards). Finally, section 2 includes relatively long narrative sections that describe the programme context rather than the programme itself.	**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 context explained and related to the object that is to be evaluated? The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, institutional. These factors may include strategies, policies, goals, frameworks & priorities at the: international level; national Government level; individual agency level	Yes			
3 Does this illuminate findings? The context should ideally be linked to the findings so that it is clear how the wider situation may have influenced the outcomes observed.	Yes			
Theory of Change				
4 Is the results chain or logic well articulated? The report should identify how the designers of the evaluated object thought that it would address the problem that they had identified. This can include a results chain or other logic models such as theory of change. It can include inputs, outputs and outcomes, it may also include impacts. The models need to be clearly described and explained.	No	Section 2 describes key programme activities but does not provide explicit information on envisaged results, and/or on the assumed logical linkages between interventions and different levels of results. While Annex B shows a representation of the country level logic model, this Annex is not referred to in the description of the object of the evaluation.	The report provides some relevant information on the object of the evaluation, and notes that the Malawi programme is part of a wider, multi-country initiative. However, the report does neither explicitly comment on the programme's logical framework or theory of change nor make explicit reference in the main body of the report to Annex B (country logic model). Furthermore, the report does not contain information on programme costs/financial resources be it at level of the multi-country CI/IHSS or the level of the programme in Malawi. Key stakeholders are mentioned in section 2, but their specific contributions are not elaborated on.	The reference to the broader, multi-country CI/IHSS is helpful. Its usefulness could be further strengthened if the report made explicit how many and which countries are included in the initiative, and how the financial resources allocated to Malawi compare to those made available to other countries. The description of the evaluation object should either briefly summarize the programme's results logic, or at least include an explicit reference to relevant Annexes (in this case Annex B) that shows the logic model. Key stakeholders should be clearly identified as such, and the types and scope of their contributions (financial/technical; geographic foci) stated.
Stakeholders and their contributions				
5 Are key stakeholders clearly identified? These include o implementing agency(ies) o development partners o rights holders o primary duty bearers o secondary duty bearers	Mostly	Section 2 mentions key stakeholders and provides some, albeit generic information on their contributions. For example, the report does not state the size and share of financial contributions that different actors have made to iCCM implementation, or that DFATD and UNICEF have made to the IHSS programme.		
6 Are key stakeholders' contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific. If joint program also specify UNICEF contribution, but if basket funding question is not applicable	Mostly		Mostly Satisfactory	
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Mostly			
Implementation Status				
8 Is the implementation status described? This includes the phase of implementation and significant changes that have happened to plans, strategies, performance frameworks, etc that have occurred - including the implications of these changes	Yes	Yes, it is clearly stated (e.g. Page 9) that the programme has come to an end.		

Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The report provides some relevant information on the object of the evaluation, and notes that the Malawi programme is part of a wider, multi-country initiative. However, the report does not explicitly comment on the programme's logical framework or theory of change. Furthermore, the report does not contain information on programme costs/financial resources.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Question	cc	Remarks	B/ Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	Constructive feedback for future reports
Purpose, objectives and scope			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.	*Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
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, objectives and scope of the evaluation are clear and realistic. The evaluation objectives and scope relate to the evaluation purpose		
10 Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic? This includes: Objectives should be clear and explain what the evaluation is seeking to achieve; Scope should clearly describe and justify what the evaluation will and will not cover; Evaluation questions may optionally be included to add additional details	Yes			
11 Do the objective and scope relate to the purpose? The reasons for holding the evaluation at this time in the project cycle (purpose) should link logically with the specific objectives the evaluation seeks to achieve and the boundaries chosen for the evaluation (scope)	Yes			
Evaluation framework				
12 Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the Purpose? It is imperative to make the basis of the value judgements used in the evaluation transparent if it is to be understood and convincing. UNEG evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria, but other criteria can be used such as Human rights and humanitarian criteria and standards (e.g. SPHERE Standards) but this needs justification.. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. The TOR may set the criteria to be used, but these should be (re)confirmed by the evaluator. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact Additional humanitarian criteria include; Coverage; Coordination; Coherence; Protection; timeliness; connectedness; appropriateness. *(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)*	Yes	The evaluation criteria for the evaluation are listed in section 3, and are also referred to throughout the report. The report does not comment on the fact that the criterion of 'efficiency' has not been included (despite the fact that the findings and conclusions sections of the report do explore issues of programme efficiency). The choice of the other criteria is justified only implicitly by referring to the evaluation TOR.	**Highly satisfactory** The evaluation purpose, objectives and scope are clear and suited to guide the evaluation. The report implicitly refers to the TOR as justification for the choice of evaluation criteria, but does not provide an explicit explanation of the chosen criteria, including the decision not to include efficiency as one of the guiding criteria.	The evaluation team may want to include a brief sentence to comment on the choice of evaluation criteria used in 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 non-OECD-DAC criterion (if applicable) and/or rejecting any standard OECD-DAC criteria (where they would be applicable) should be explained in the report.	Mostly			
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**The evaluation purpose, objectives and scope are clear and suited to guide the evaluation. The evaluation should have included a brief sentence to comment on the choice of evaluation criteria used in the evaluation.**		

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

Question	cc	Remarks	C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?	Constructive feedback for future reports
Data collection				
14 Does the report specify data collection methods, analysis methods, sampling methods and benchmarks? This should include the rationale for selecting methods and their limitations based on commonly accepted best practice.	Yes	Section 4 of the report provides a detailed description and justification of the chosen methods of data collection and analysis, and of data sources. In addition, section 7 discusses strengths and limitations of the chosen sources and approaches. This section should, however, be presented as part of the evaluation methodology.	**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*
15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits	Yes			
Ethics				
16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done	Mostly	Ethical issues are taken into account throughout the report. Section 4.2 provides some information on considerations that have guided the evaluation. For example, it is noted that stakeholder consultations aimed to gain wide range of opinions and ensure fair representation of how IHSS was experienced in Malawi. It might have been helpful to slightly elaborate on this, e.g. by commenting on considerations over whether and how to include and reach stakeholders who may not have benefited from, and may not have been included in IHSS implementation. The report does not explicitly comment on ethical safeguards put in place. However, the existence of at least some safeguards is indicated by the fact that stakeholder confidentiality is ensured by making only generic reference to specific stakeholders cited in the report.		
17 Does the report refer to ethical safeguards appropriate for the issues described? When the topic of an evaluation is contentious, there is a heightened need to protect those participating. These should be guided by the UNICEF Evaluation Office Technical Note and include: protection of confidentiality; protection of rights; protection of dignity and welfare of people (especially children); Informed consent; Feedback to participants; Mechanisms for shaping the behaviour of evaluators and data collectors	Mostly			
Results Based Management				
18 Is the capability and robustness of the evaluated object's monitoring system adequately assessed? The evaluation should consider the details and overall functioning of the management system in relation to results: from the M&E system design, through individual tools, to the use of data in management decision making.	Yes	The capability and robustness of existing systems and processes for monitoring and evaluation are being discussed on page 57f. Indicators used to measure programme effectiveness were aligned with the global IHSS indicators of the Expanded Results Framework. The report does, however, not comment on the appropriateness and usability of these indicators. Also, on page 57f it is not always clear whether the report comments on monitoring activities conducted under and for the IHSS specifically, or, more broadly, activities conducted under the existing Malawi Health Management Information System.	The report presents a transparent description of the methodology applied, and discusses related strengths as well as limitations. The presented methodology is robust and appropriate in light of the evaluation questions that the review tried to answer. The evaluation team made credible efforts to assess project impact by constructing a theoretical counterfactual using the Lives Saved Tool. The report gives some indication of ethical considerations that guided data collection, but could be further strengthened by adding some detail in this regard. Similarly, a sentence or two on expectations guiding the conduct of evaluation team members, and on relevant stakeholder safeguards put in place would be beneficial. Currently, the report does not entail information on the number and distribution of stakeholders consulted for the	To enhance readability of the report we would have suggested moving the information on strengths and limitations of different types of data collection and analysis conducted as part of the evaluation (currently section 7) to an earlier part of the report, ideally to section 4 on methodology. The evaluation team may want to consider including a brief summary into the methodology section that shows how many and what types of individuals and/or organizations have been consulted for the evaluation (e.g. divided by government organization, non-government organization, UNICEF etc.). If feasible, information on community level stakeholders consulted should be broken down by sex, as well as (if relevant) other socio-economic criteria. In addition, a full list of consulted stakeholders should be
19 Does the evaluation make appropriate use of the M&E framework of the evaluated object? In addition to articulating the logic model (results chain) used by the programme, the evaluation should make use of the object's logframe or other results framework to guide the assessment. The results framework indicates how the programme design team expected to assess effectiveness, and it forms the guiding structure for the management of implementation.	Mostly			

Human Rights, Gender and Equity				
			distribution of stakeholders consulted for the evaluation.	list of consulted stakeholders should be included as an Appendix. Furthermore, future reports may want to include a note on whether and how stakeholders were involved in the evaluation process beyond being interviewed/surveyed, and how this level of involvement was chosen.
20 Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity? This could be done in a variety of ways including: use of a rights-based framework, use of CRC, CCC, CEDAW and other rights related benchmarks, analysis of right holders and duty bearers and focus on aspects of equity, social exclusion and gender. Style includes: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups. Promote gender-sensitive interventions as a core programmatic priority, To the extent possible, all relevant policies, programmes and activities will mainstream gender equality.	Yes	The evaluation style and design reflect incorporation of the UN's and UNICEF's commitment to human rights-based programming, gender equality and equity. Selected data are, for example, disaggregated by richest and poorest wealth quintiles. Gender equality issues are addressed in evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation reflects a human rights perspective by exploring not only what the project has done (or could have done) in relation to strengthening the capacity of duty bearers, but also that of rights holders (e.g. through strategies to enhance care seeking behaviour).	Highly satisfactory	
21 Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the evaluated object was monitored through human rights (inc. gender, equity & child rights) frameworks? UNICEF commits to go beyond monitoring the achievement of desirable outcomes, and to ensure that these are achieved through morally acceptable processes. The evaluation should consider whether the programme was managed and adjusted according to human rights and gender monitoring of processes.	Mostly			
22 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on HUMAN RIGHTS (inc. women & child rights)? The inclusion of human rights frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the level of: Identification of the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers, as well as the immediate underlying & structural causes of the non realisation of rights.; Capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations. Support for humanitarian action – achieving faster scaling up of response, early identification of priorities and strategies, rapid deployment of qualified staff and clear accountabilities and responses consistent with humanitarian principles in situations of unrest or armed conflict.	Yes			
23 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT? The inclusion of gender equality frameworks in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the immediate underlying & structural causes of social exclusion; and capacity development of women to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil their equality obligations.	Yes			
24 Do the methodology, analytical framework, findings, conclusions, recommendations & lessons provide appropriate information on EQUITY? The inclusion of equity considerations in the evaluation methodology should continue to cascade down the evaluation report and be obvious in the data analysis, findings, conclusions, any recommendations and any lessons learned. If identified in the scope the methodology should be capable of assessing the capacity development of rights-holders to claim rights, and duty-bearers to fulfil obligations & aspects of equity.	Yes			

Stakeholder participation			
25 Are the levels and activities of stakeholder consultation described? This goes beyond just using stakeholders as sources of information and includes the degree of participation in the evaluation itself. The report should include the rationale for selecting this level of participation. Roles for participation might include: o Liaison o Technical advisory o Observer o Active decision making The reviewer should look for the soundness of the description and rationale for the degree of participation rather than the level of participation itself.	Mostly	The report describes the different types of stakeholder consultations conducted, but does not comment on the chosen types and levels of these consultations and of stakeholder participation overall. It is, for example, not noted whether draft evaluation deliverables (in particular findings, conclusions and recommendations) have been shared with and adjusted based on feedback from key stakeholders at national and/or local levels. The report does not include a list of consulted stakeholders.	
26 Are the levels of participation appropriate for the task in hand? The breadth & degree of stakeholder participation feasible in evaluation activities will depend partly on the kind of participation achieved in the evaluated object. The reviewer should note here whether a higher degree of participation may have been feasible & preferable.	Mostly		
Methodological robustness			
27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual or address issues of contribution/attribution? 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.	Outstanding	The reports makes laudable efforts to address issues of contribution/attribution by using the Lives Saved Tool (LiST) to assess the extent to which changes in child mortality could be attributed to changes in intervention coverage. The methodology does facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation, and noted limitations are acceptable for the task in hand.	
28 Does the methodology facilitate answers to the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.	Yes		
29 Are methodological limitations acceptable for the task in hand? Limitations must be specifically recognised and appropriate efforts taken to control bias. This includes the use of triangulation, and the use of robust data collection tools (interview protocols, observation tools etc). Bias limitations can be addressed in three main areas: Bias inherent in the sources of data; Bias introduced through the methods of data collection; Bias that colours the interpretation of findings	Yes		
Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		**The report describes the methodology and its related strengths and limitations. The methodology is robust and appropriate in light of the evaluation questions. Even though the evaluation team made credible efforts to assess project impact, the report could have been more explicit in relation to safeguards and on information on the number and distribution of stakeholders consulted.**	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question	cc	Remarks	D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis? Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Completeness and logic of findings				
30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence? Findings regarding the inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from results. Findings on results should clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes and impacts (where appropriate). Findings must demonstrate full marshalling and objective use of the evidence generated by the evaluation data collection. Findings should also tell the 'whole story' of the evidence and avoid bias.	Mostly	Section 5 of the report (p.41-96) provides a thorough overview of the evidence collected by the evaluation team in relation to the evaluation criteria and research questions. This evidence is solid and detailed, but it is often difficult for the reader to identify actual findings and key messages that the evaluation team is aiming to bring across. Often, evidence is presented, but is neither synthesized nor assessed. This approach also makes the findings section rather long, which negatively affects readability of the report. No unexpected findings are discussed.		
31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions? The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.	Yes			
32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported? There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.	Mostly		The report presents solid and detailed evidence in relation to the evaluation criteria and questions. At the same time it does consistently succeed in synthesizing this evidence into clearly articulated findings. This makes it often difficult for the reader to understand the evaluation team's assessment of the respective evaluation question, and distinguish more from less relevant information. This is better resolved in the conclusions section, which visibly highlights key messages.	Future reports would benefit from including a way to clearly identify key findings in order to better guide readers of the report. This can be done in various ways, including the formulation of explicit findings at the beginning of each section, or by using sub-headings more consistently to not only introduce a certain topic, but to communicate the evaluation team's overall assessment of this issue. Alternatively the report could include a brief summary of key findings at the end of each thematic (sub)section. The format used in the evaluation brief (i.e. visibly highlighted, crisp, and numbered conclusions) provides the reader with welcome orientation. Future reports may want to use this format also in the main body of the report, while avoiding to present detailed evidence in the conclusions section.
33 Are gaps and limitations discussed? The data may be inadequate to answer all the evaluation questions as satisfactorily as intended, in this case the limitations should be clearly presented and discussed. Caveats should be included to guide the reader on how to interpret the findings. Any gaps in the programme or unintended effects should also be addressed.	Yes			
34 Are unexpected findings discussed? If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.	No			
Cost Analysis				
35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported? Cost analysis is not always feasible or appropriate. If this is the case then the reasons should be explained. Otherwise the evaluation should use an appropriate scope and methodology of cost analysis to answer the following questions: o How programme costs compare to other similar programmes or standards o Most efficient way to get expected results o Cost implications of scaling up or down o Cost implications for replicating in a different context o Is the programme worth doing from a cost perspective o Costs and the sustainability of the programme.	Outstanding	Section 5.4 provides a detailed cost analysis as part of assessing IHSS sustainability. The analysis is concrete, practical, and likely to be of practical use to evaluation users.		

Contribution and causality		
36 Does the evaluation make a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders? For results attributed to the programme, the result should be mapped as accurately as possible to the inputs of different stakeholders.	Mostly	The evaluation makes fair and reasonable attempts to assign contribution to results to UNICEF and the IHSS. It does sometimes, but not consistently comment on other actors or factors that are also likely to have contributed to the noted changes. Reasons for accomplishments and failures are identified as relevant and possible based on available data.
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	
Strengths, weaknesses and implications		
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	Yes, future implications of existing constraints are discussed, e.g. Ongoing limitations based on the practice of deploying HSAs outside their respective catchment area. The conclusions present both strengths and weaknesses of the programme.
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	
Completeness and insight of conclusions		
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.	Mostly	The conclusions contain relevant insights and do, albeit to varying degrees, add value to the findings section. Positive is also that in most cases, key conclusions are visibly highlighted by using bold font. This makes it easy for the reader to identify key messages - something that, as noted above, is missing in the findings section. There are, however, a few cases where the bold font merely presents a sub-heading (e.g. "women's participation and gender equality") rather than a conclusion. Some conclusions could be shortened as they currently present detailed evidence that had better be placed in the findings section. The separately presented evaluation brief provides an even crisper and sharper formulation of numbered conclusions than is presented in the main report.
41 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	
42 Are the conclusions pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation? Conclusions should speak to the evaluation participants, stakeholders and users. These may cover a wide range of groups and conclusions should thus be stated clearly and accessibly: adding value and understanding to the report (for example, some stakeholders may not understand the methodology or findings, but the conclusions should clarify what these findings mean to them in the context of the programme).	Mostly	

Rating (vertical): **Mostly Satisfactory**

Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The report presents solid and detailed evidence in relation to the evaluation criteria and questions. At the same time it does not consistently succeed in synthesizing this evidence into clearly articulated findings. This makes it often difficult for the reader to understand the evaluation team's assessment of the respective evaluation questions.

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Question	cc	Remarks		
Relevance and clarity of recommendations			**E/ Are the recommendations and lessons learned relevant and actionable?** Recommendations should be relevant and actionable to the object and purpose of the evaluation, be supported by evidence and conclusions, and be developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should clearly identify the target group for each recommendation, be clearly stated with priorities for action, be actionable and reflect an understanding of the commissioning organization and potential constraints to follow up.	**Constructive feedback for future reports** *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Mostly	Recommendations are grounded in the evidence and conclusions. It is, however, not always easy to establish this link given that, as noted under review question 30 above, evaluation findings are not clearly identified. The recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, but their presentation can be considerably strengthened. There are currently 11 recommendations that are neither numbered nor prioritized. Also, it would be helpful for readers if the actual recommendations was visibly distinguished from its justification. At the moment, it takes a while to identify which information in each bullet point contains the recommendation.		
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes			
45 Are recommendations clearly stated and prioritised? If the recommendations are few in number (up to 5) then this can also be considered to be prioritised. Recommendations that are over-specific or represent a long list of items are not of as much value to managers. Where there is a long list of recommendations, the most important should be ordered in priority.	No			
Usefulness of recommendations			The recommendations section could be strengthened by ensuring that recommendations are numbered, prioritized, and addressed to specific target groups for action. Also, lessons learned should focus on those insights that are likely to be of relevance in other, similar settings beyond the specific circumstances of the object of the evaluation.	In future reports the evaluation team may want to ensure that recommendations are numbered, prioritized, and that each is addressed to one or more specific target groups for action. It can also be helpful to visibly distinguish between the actual recommendation on the one side, and information that either constitutes a justification for this recommendation or suggestions for its implementation on the other side. This can be done, for example by using bold font for the actual recommendation.
46 Does each recommendation clearly identify the target group for action? Recommendations should provide clear and relevant suggestions for action linked to the stakeholders who might put that recommendation into action. This ensures that the evaluators have a good understanding of the programme dynamics and that recommendations are realistic.	No	The recommendations do not identify one or more specific target groups for action. This is likely to make it difficult to track and ensure accountability for appropriate responses to the recommendations. Not directing the recommendations to specific target groups also makes it difficult to assess the extent to which they are realistic and actionable. The report does not explicitly comment on the process followed in developing the recommendations.		
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? This includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Mostly			
48 Does the report describe the process followed in developing the recommendations? The preparation of recommendations needs to suit the evaluation process. Participation by stakeholders in the development of recommendations is strongly encouraged to increase ownership and utility.	No			
Appropriate lessons learned				
49 Are lessons learned correctly identified? Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They may refine or add to commonly accepted understanding, but should not be merely a repetition of common knowledge. Findings and conclusions specific to the evaluated object are not lessons learned.	Mostly	Section 8.1 identifies several lessons learned. Most of the noted observations do, however, not constitute generalizable lessons, but are findings that are specific to the evaluated object and/or timeframe.		
50 Are lessons learned generalised to indicate what wider relevance they may have? Correctly identified lessons learned should include an analysis of how they can be applied to contexts and situations outside of the evaluated object.	No			

Rating column (cc): Mostly Satisfactory

Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The recommendations section could be strengthened by ensuring that recommendations are numbered, prioritized, and addressed to specific target groups for action. The lessons learned should be reviewed to ensure that what is presented actually constitutes concrete and generalizable lessons rather than findings.

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR

Question	cc	Remarks	F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report? The report should be logically structured with clarity and coherence (e.g. background and objectives are presented before findings, and findings are presented before conclusions and recommendations). It should read well and be focused.	Constructive feedback for future reports *Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice*
Style and presentation				
51. Do the opening pages contain all the basic elements? Basic elements include all of: Name of the evaluated object; Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report; Locations of the evaluated object; Names and/or organisations of evaluators; Name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation; Table of contents including tables, graphs, figures and annex; List of acronyms	Yes	The opening pages do not contain the timeframe of the evaluation or the date of the report. All other required items are included. The report is logically structured, and the presented annexes contain appropriate elements that increase the usefulness and credibility of the report. It would have been helpful to also include the TOR, a copy of the evaluation matrix/framework, a list of consulted stakeholders, as well as the main data collection tools.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Yes		The different elements do come together in a well structured, logical and coherent report. Readability of the report could, however, be improved both by ensuring that key findings are more prominently identified as such, which in turn might also help to somewhat reduce the length of the report. At present, the findings section of the report tends to read more like a scientific paper than a (utilization and user-oriented) evaluation report. The executive summary could be considerably shortened.	Readability of the report could be improved by ensuring that key findings are more prominently identified as such. For the conclusions, the format used in the Evaluation Brief (crisp, numbered conclusions) could also be used in the main report and Executive Summary. The executive summary could be shortened by deleting detailed descriptive sections. The evaluation team, in consultation with UNICEF, may want to consider limiting the Executive Summary to a brief description of the Methodology, Conclusions and Recommendations, i.e. not provide detailed information on findings.
53 Do the annexes contain appropriate elements? Appropriate elements may include: ToRs; List of interviewees and site visits; List of documentary evidence; Details on methodology; Data collection instruments; Information about the evaluators; Copy of the evaluation matrix; Copy of the Results chain. Where they add value to the report	Mostly			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Mostly			
Executive Summary				
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 56 to 58 should be N/A	Yes	The Executive Summary is included and contains all necessary elements. At present, however, the Summary is very long (15 pages), which might decrease its utility for decision makers.	Highly satisfactory	
56 Does the executive summary contain all the necessary elements? Necessary elements include all of: Overview of the evaluated object; Evaluation objectives and intended audience; Evaluation methodology; Most important findings and conclusions; Main recommendations	Yes			
57 Can the executive summary stand alone? It should not require reference to the rest of the report documents and should not introduce new information or arguments	Yes			
58 Can the executive summary inform decision making? It should be short (ideally 2-3 pages), and increase the utility for decision makers by highlight key priorities.	Mostly			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*		The different elements do come together in a structured, logical and coherent report. Readability of the report could be improved by ensuring that key findings are more prominently identified as such, which in turn might also help to somewhat reduce the length of the report. The executive summary could be shortened to enhance its potential utility for time-pressed decision makers.		

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	TORs were not available for review.
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation	1. The evaluation team's attempts to establish attribution/contribution to impact level results by using the LiST tool to create a theoretical counterfactual. 2. The thorough and forward looking cost analysis as the basis for assessing project sustainability.
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	The report reflects in depth knowledge of the evaluation team of the medical/health issues that the programme under review was trying to address.

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?	Mostly	The report presents sufficient and robust evidence, but does not consistently succeed in presenting the results of the evaluation team's analysis and assessment.	The report presents robust evidence that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives, and the different elements of the report do come together in a well structured, logical and coherent report. The report does, however, not consistently succeed in presenting the results of the evaluation team's analysis and assessment. Readability of the report could be considerably improved by ensuring that key findings are more prominently identified as such, and that recommendations are addressed to specific target groups of actors.
ii/ To what extent do the six sections hold together in a logically consistent way that provides common threads throughout the report? The report should hold together not just as individually appropriately elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Yes	The report does hold together in a logically consistent way.	*Mostly Satisfactory*
iii/ Are there any reasons of note that might explain the overall performance or particular aspects of this evaluation report? This is a chance to note mitigating factors and/or crucial issues apparent in the review of the report.	ToRs		
	Other		
Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. *Up to two sentences*	The report presents evidence that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives. At the same time it does not consistently succeed in presenting the results of the evaluation team's analysis and assessment. The different elements of the report do come together in a structured, logical and coherent report. However, readability of the report could be considerably improved by ensuring that key findings are more prominently identified, and that recommendations are addressed to specific target groups of actors.		