



GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool


Version 2018.1


Reviewers: complete all cells highlighted in Yellow



		Notes for QA
Title of the Evaluation Report	Evaluation of UNICEF Viet Nam Rural Sanitation and Hygiene Programme (RSHP) 2012 – 2016	
Report sequence number	2018/003	
Region	EAPR	
Year of Report	2018	
Office	Vietnam	
Coverage (countries)	Vietnam	
ToRs present	Yes	
Date of Review	10/12/2018	
Name of reviewer	ImpactReady	
Classification of Evaluation Report		
Management of Evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions</i>)		UNICEF managed
SPOA Correspondence <i>(Alignment with SPOA focus area priorities)</i>	Health	No
	HIV/AIDS	No
	WASH	Yes
	Nutrition	No
	Education	No
	Child protection	No
	Social inclusion	No
	Gender equality (cross-cutting)	No
	Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
Evaluation object		Programme
Evaluation type		Summative and formative
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods
Evaluation design		Theory-based


Evaluation level		Outcome
Geographic Scope		National
SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		100%
Question 1.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	100%
	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status	Yes
	Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	Yes
	Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)	Yes
Question 2.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	100%
	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)	Yes
	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention	Yes
	Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention	Yes
Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	100%
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	Yes
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	Yes
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	100%
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	Yes
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section A	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of the background. It sets the context to understand the WASH situation of the vulnerable populations that the programme sought to support, including relevant data about access to services and the state management system and policies within the context of a middle-income country. The situation of the public entities and population is also explained with data. The results expected per project and per program are included, along with the theory of change. The stakeholders involved are clearly defined and their roles very clearly described.</p>		 4
Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
<p>This section reflects good practices and does not require improvement. However, the theory of change in figure 2.2. (page 25-26), while very comprehensive, uses very small font that hinders its comprehension. The figure could be presented in 3 pages to make it more readable.</p>		0.05
SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		100%


Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	100%
	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve	Yes
	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation	Yes
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	100%
	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR	Yes
	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention)	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section B	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Highly Satisfactory
	The evaluation states the reasons for conducting it and the objectives it seeks to achieve. It also develops in detail who are the intended users and how they will use the evaluation results (table 2.1. in page 28). The objectives are also described and the scope is clearly delimited in several dimensions in section 2.5.1 on page 29.	 4
	Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.	0.05
SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)		100%
Question 7.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	100%
	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation	Yes
	If the framework is OTHER than UNICEF standard criteria, or if not all standard criteria of the chosen framework are included, the reasons for this are clearly explained and the chosen framework is clearly described	Yes
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	100%
	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope	Yes



	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated	Yes
	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?	Yes
	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?	Yes
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:	100%
	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	Yes
	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm)	Yes
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section C	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Highly Satisfactory
	The report shows evidence of how the methodology section meets UNICEF's standards for a solid, trustable evaluation. Firstly, it reflects rich evaluation-specific knowledge, by describing a hybrid evaluation approach by merging several relevant frameworks. Secondly, by adding sector specific analytical frameworks such as the 'Social Norms Theory', it also demonstrates a good fit by customizing the design to the nature of the programme. The variety of methods and sources used also reinforces evidence of a solid data collection process. The report also describes methods for analysis, multiple mechanisms for quality assurance of the data (both internal and external) and full disclosure of ethical considerations and limitations faced (with their mitigation measures).	 4
	Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.	0.15
SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)		100%
Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	100%
	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria	Yes
	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings	Yes
Question 11.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.	100%

	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	Yes
	Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison.	Yes
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	Yes
	The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	100%
	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic; M&E tools and their usage)	Yes
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section D	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Highly Satisfactory
	The finding section meet all requirements of a good quality report. It answers all of the evaluation questions, and even probes deeper beyond the question (example: it goes beyond the way the relevance question is asked and explores the relevance of the program in regards to multiple stakeholders' priorities). It includes the questions and summaries of the answers, and titles for most of the contents, which facilitates the reading and understanding of the section. It adds success cases and other qualitative and quantitative data to reinforce the messages.	 4
	Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required. However, to increase the clarity of some of the tables, it is recommended to convert some of the multiple tables (example: table 3.8 in page 66) with data into graphs for better display of the evidence (such as figure 3.5. in page 76).	0.2
SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)		89%
Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	78%
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly
	Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase)	Mostly
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	Yes
Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	100%
	Correctly identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	Yes
•••-	Executive Feedback on Section E	Overall rating for Section

The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions gathered in the report come to summarize and give closure to the findings sections. They capture the final insights about each criterion and are appropriately derived from the findings. However, they are rather brief and some further analysis could reinforce the report. For example, regarding the Cross-cutting priorities, the report merely states on page 92: "The Programme approaches and interventions suggest coherence with the principles of equity, gender, resilience and HRBA", without further explanation or further development derived from the findings. The lessons learned are present and capture knowledge identified during the evaluation process.</p>		 3
Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
<p>To improve the report, the conclusions section could have been further developed, both in length and in depth of analysis. This is particularly the case for conclusions regarding the cross-cutting questions that include many important issues regarding the evaluation approach and focus.</p>		0.15
SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		94%
Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	89%
	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	Mostly
	Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation)	Yes
	Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation	Yes
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	100%
	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	Yes
	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section F	Overall rating for Section
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations presented in the report suggest actionable ideas to move the program forward. The fact that they are clearly structured by subject, priority and implementation group greatly facilitates the implementation process. The process to elaborate them is also well explained and quite participatory, which increases their relevance. Finally, the connection with the conclusions and findings is implicit and could have been further specified.</p>		 3
Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting

<p>The recommendations sections could be strengthened by adding clear reference to the findings or conclusions originating each of them.</p>		0.15
<p>SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</p>		100%
Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	100%
	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes-; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers	Yes
	Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s)	Yes
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured?	100%
	The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles	Yes
	Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section G	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Highly Satisfactory
	The report is nicely packaged and uses a logical structure. Initial pages include introductory elements including title, country, names of evaluators, lists and acronyms. The list of annexes is very complete and informative and includes all recommendations on annexes within UNICEF's guidelines. The structure is easy to navigate and the use of colored fonts for different types of titles is helpful for the reader.	 4
Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting
<p>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.</p>		0.05
<p>SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)</p>		89%
Question 19.	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?	100%
	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation	Yes

	Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)	Yes
	Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: 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
Question 20.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	100%
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention	Yes
	Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention	Yes
	Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children	Yes
	Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the ToRs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.)	Yes
Question 21.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?	Approaches requirements
	Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards	6
UN-SWAP criterion 1:	GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW related data will be collected	Fully integrated 3 points
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	A gender responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated 2 points
UN-SWAP criterion 3:	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated 1 point
• • • -	Executive Feedback on Section H	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). The rater should include one labelled sentence for each of the UN-SWAP criteria.	Satisfactory
	Evidence demonstrates how the evaluation was sensitive to these cross-cutting question, putting gender equity and human rights at the centre of the design by choosing an HR-based approach. Participation in the evaluation was promoted amongst stakeholders thanks to the evaluation reference group that included UNICEF staff and public workers. Equity considerations in the design and implementation are discussed in section 3.6 (page 82). While gender equality is adequately integrated in to the evaluation design and methodology, gender is not discussed in the evaluation conclusions.	 3
	Additional justifications for UN-SWAP ratings	
UN-SWAP criterion 1:	Human rights and gender equity are at the core of the evaluation design, evidenced by the evaluation questions including a specific criterion on these questions and a clear focus reflected by the chosen approach.	
UN-SWAP criterion 2:	Methods and tools were gender sensitive, although specific tools such as a Gender Analysis could have further reinforced this section.	
UN-SWAP criterion 3:	Section 3.6. of the findings discusses cross-cutting matters but the conclusions section does not adequately address them.	
	Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting

<p>The report could strengthen its focus on GEEW by including GEEW-specific methods such as a Gender Analysis (https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resource/tool/gender_analysis_tool) and by consecrating more space and a deeper analysis to the consequences of the findings in this area shown in the conclusions section.</p>		0.15
<p>SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</p>		100%
Question 22.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	100%
	An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users	Yes
	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations)	Yes
	Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report	Yes
••••	Executive Feedback on Section I	Overall rating for Section
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Highly Satisfactory
	The Executive Summary clearly presents the key messages from the evaluation. By including small titles to separate content, it follows the structure of the report, providing an overview of each element. The report presents the most critical elements (context, object, objectives, purpose, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations), while providing sufficient depth within each section. The report is easy to read and is presented in a way that makes it user-friendly.	 4
<p>Additional comments for Section I (recommendations for improvement)</p>		Weighting
<p>This section reflects good practices. No further improvement is required.</p>		0.05
<p>Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1</p>		
<p>OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)</p>		
••••	Highly Satisfactory	 3.55
<p>Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence</p>		
<p>Lessons for improving the management and performance of future evaluations</p>		
<p>This evaluation is based on a solid, constant display of evaluation competencies and a thorough compliance to UNICEF's good reporting guidelines, making the report excel in many of its sections. This being said, the conclusions could have been expanded and enriched to provide more analytical reflection. Additionally, the use of a gender analysis would have increased the report's sensitivity to gender equality.</p>		