



UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template

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

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

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

UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System		UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System		UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards	
Response					
Title of the Evaluation Report		Real-Time Evaluation of UNICEF's Response to the Sa'ada Conflict in Northern Yemen			
Report sequence number	2010/006	Date of Review	04/04/2011	Year of the Evaluation Report	2010
Region	Middle East and North Africa Regional Office			Country(ies)	Yemen
Type of Report	Evaluation			TORs Present	Yes
Name of reviewer	IOD PARC				
Classification of Evaluation Report					Comments
Geographical <i>(Coverage of the programme being evaluated & generalizability of evaluation findings)</i>	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 <i>(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</i>	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.				
Purpose <i>(Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)</i>	3.4 Real-time-evaluation: In the context of an emergency, an evaluation of the efficacy of the response, which collates lessons that can be applied back to an on-going response				
	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				
Result <i>(Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)</i>	4.1 Output: Causal effects deriving directly from programme activities, and assumed to be completely under programme control				
MTSP Correspondence <i>(Alignment with MTSP focus area priorities: (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights)</i>	5.2 Multi-sectoral: Addresses issues in two or more MTSP focus areas				
Level of Independence <i>(Implementation and control of the evaluation activities)</i>	6.2 Independent internal: The evaluation is implemented by consultants but managed in-house by UNICEF professionals. The overall responsibility for the evaluation lies within the division whose work is being evaluated.				
Timing / Stage	7.1 Formative: An evaluation with the purpose and aim of improving the programme. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated by examining the delivery of the programme				

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION			
Question	cc	Remarks	
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.	Almost	The whole style of the report is concise and accessible. However, this comes at the price of detail in some places. For instance, although lots of parts of the UNICEF emergency response are referenced throughout the report, there is no clear summary section that describes what exactly happened, how much resources were allocated to this and what the intended results were (there is a useful one page timeline in the annexes). The wider context is described in terms of the national experience, although more detail could have been added on the range of humanitarian actors.	<p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
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.	Almost	In a sense the theory of change of an emergency response is well documented and clear. However, the report notes that UNICEF Yemen was geared for development and so it would have been beneficial to articulate exactly what aims it sought to achieve in the initial phase of response, and what influenced those aims.	
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	Almost	Multiple stakeholders are mentioned throughout the report. However, these are at no point drawn together or summarised.	Almost Confident to Act
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	Almost	There appears to have been an unwillingness to share information from some parties, however, there is no data presented even from the organisations that were open to sharing information.	
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Almost		
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	The report develops a strong story line regarding the past, present and future emergency response.	
Executive Feedback on Section A Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The concise style of the report contributes greatly to readability and usefulness of the context sections, but come at the cost of detailed information about operations, inputs and aims that would enhance the later analysis.		

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			
Question	cc	Remarks	
Purpose, objectives and scope			
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 role of this real time evaluation in terms of lessons learning is made abundantly clear and is extremely strong. The scope is detailed and precise. The major objectives are also clear (although some more detailed evaluation questions might have added some value). Everything ties together really well and underpins the other strengths of this report.	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.
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 <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Yes	The evaluation framework is very clearly laid out and is aligned to the purpose. The criteria largely match with the OECD DAC standards for humanitarian evaluation, although there is some adaption. The reason for this adaptation is unclear, however, the transparency and clarity of the evaluation framework and its response to the purpose means that any lack of explanation does not undermine the quality of the report.	Confident to Act
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		
Executive Feedback on Section B Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The clarity and precise description of the purpose, scope and evaluation criteria are the fundamental underpinnings of the success of this report. This could have been further enhanced primarily through having more detail around objectives and justification for the non-standard set of evaluation criteria.		
			Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>

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

Question	cc	Remarks		
Data collection			<p>C/ Is the methodology appropriate and sound?</p> <p>The report should present a transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve the evaluation purposes.</p> <p>The report should also present a sufficiently detailed description of methodology in which methodological choices are made explicit and justified and in which limitations of methodology applied are included. The report should give the elements to assess the appropriateness of the methodology. Methods as such are not 'good' or 'bad', they are only so in relation to what one tries to get to know as part of an evaluation. Thus this standard assesses the suitability of the methods selected for the specifics of the evaluation concerned, assessing if the methodology is suitable to the subject matter and the information collected are sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>The methodology makes reference to standard real-time evaluation best practice and focuses on participatory qualitative tools (suitable for the learning objective). As with the rest of the report, the decision of the authors to write concisely means that some methodology detail is skipped, but this is not critical.</p>		
<p>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</p>	Yes			
Ethics				
<p>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</p>	No	<p>There is no suggestion that the evaluation was unethical - indeed, the participatory approaches that were deployed are likely to have acted to safeguard ethics. Nevertheless, these were used for methodological and not ethical reasons. No specific consideration is given to ethics in the report (indeed an incident of children dying because of poorly made decisions by UNICEF is stated matter-of-factly and no additional analysis is provided.)</p>		
<p>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</p>	No			
Results Based Management			<p>Confident to Act</p>	<p>In addition to using human rights as a framework for the evaluation, it is a requirement that evaluations assess the degree to which emergency responses were themselves monitored using a human rights framework. Furthermore, it is good practice to identify the results frameworks that the response was using or should have been using, and the extent to which the capability existed to deploy these. Finally, it is a requirement of all evaluations to explicitly state ethical considerations and safeguards.</p>
<p>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.</p>	Almost	<p>The lack of data is a key finding and recommendation of the report. However, more information could have been provided about either the formal systems or informal systems that have evolved to pass results information between the field and country office.</p>		
<p>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.</p>	Almost			
Human Rights, Gender and Equity				
<p>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</p>	Yes	<p>The report takes the Core Commitments to Children as a key starting point. This provides a strong analytical framework for the evaluation that is grounded in human rights. The report consistently uses this framework to identify issues in the emergency response and to prioritise gaps. Similarly, some gender disaggregated data and analysis is included, and there is specific reference made to equity in analysing the needs of IDPs. However, the</p>		

<p>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.</p>	No	<p>lack of results data restricts the opportunity for this to be used more consistently throughout the report. There is no assessment of UNICEF's ability to monitor its actions through a rights-based framework.</p>			
<p>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.</p>	Yes				
<p>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.</p>	Almost				
<p>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.</p>	Almost				
Stakeholder participation					
<p>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.</p>	Almost	<p>The methodology indicates that participatory workshops were held and the annexes include references to the key informant interviews that were conducted. As a learning exercise the evaluators appear to have made a concerted effort to engage stakeholders as active participants (in this sense it might be seen as a shame that this evaluation was restricted only to UNICEF). However, the concise style of the report does not always</p>			

<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>Concise style of the report does not always provide a full picture of which stakeholders participated in which ways.</p>		
Methodological robustness				
<p>27 Is there an attempt to construct a counterfactual? The counterfactual can be constructed in several ways which can be more or less rigorous. It can be done by contacting eligible beneficiaries that were not reached by the programme, or a theoretical counterfactual based on historical trends, or it can also be a comparison group.</p>	No	<p>The evaluators did want to compare the UNICEF response to that of another set of international humanitarian actors, but the latter group declined from sharing data. There was no attempt to establish what might have been the case had UNICEF not intervened. However, this does not erode the overall report because it attempts to learn operational lessons rather than determine impact. Furthermore, the limitations of the methodology are transparently articulated and mitigated where possible.</p>		
<p>28 Can the methodology answer the evaluation questions in the context of the evaluation? The methodology should link back to the Purpose and be capable of providing answers to the evaluation questions.</p>	Yes			
<p>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</p>	Yes			
<p>Executive Feedback on Section C Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The methodology used was entirely appropriate to the purpose. However, it also created limitations in terms of presenting and analysing data on results that were not successfully overcome even though this information could have added considerable value. The exclusion of any information on ethics is also an issue of notable concern.</p>			

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	cc	Remarks		
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.	Yes	Findings are systematically presented and very clear. They present the outcome of analysis rather than the data itself (as many reports mistakenly do). The findings do not attempt to go beyond the evidence that could be marshalled, and are therefore (rightfully) limited to operational areas rather than results or efficiency. The clarity of the evaluation framework is reflected in the findings: each criteria is systematically and clearly addressed, or (in the case of efficiency) an explanation is provided about why it could not be assessed. Each finding is presented alongside an logical explanation of its causation, and gaps are very clearly drawn out. The lack of quantitative evidence and the style of the findings suggest that they are the result of agreed consensus from the participatory workshops: i.e. that the report is acting more as an aide memoire for people who already have ownership of the findings, rather than presenting the full case. This is consistent with the learning purpose.	Almost Confident to Act	<p>D/ Are the findings and conclusions, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence & sound analysis?</p> <p>Findings should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report. They should be based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.</p> <p>Conclusions should present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence, providing insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.</p>
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.	Yes			
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.	Yes			
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	The evaluators wanted to benchmark costs against other humanitarian operators in the emergency. This was not possible for justifiable reasons and is explained. However, no attempt is made to reference experiences internationally, and the core cost data could still have been presented.		
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.	Yes	The report takes a constructive approach to clearly identifying the roles of stakeholders in important outputs - or lack of. Whilst being explicit, this appears to have been derived from the participatory workshops and so it is		<p style="text-align: center;">Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>

<p>37 Do conclusions take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders? As well as being logically derived from findings, conclusions should seek to represent the range of views encountered in the evaluation, and not simply reflect the bias of the individual evaluator. Carrying these diverse views through to the presentation of conclusions (considered here) is only possible if the methodology has gathered and analysed information from a broad range of stakeholders.</p>	Yes	from the participatory workshops and so it is framed in a learning context rather than as summative assessment. Views from the full range of stakeholders are referenced throughout the report.			
<p>38 Are causal reasons for accomplishments and failures identified as much as possible? These should be concise and usable. They should be based on the evidence and be theoretically robust. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i></p>	Yes				
Strengths, weaknesses and implications					
<p>39 Are the future implications of continuing constraints discussed? The implications can be, for example, in terms of the cost of the programme, ability to deliver results, reputational risk, and breach of human rights obligations.</p>	Yes	The findings weigh up both the strengths and weaknesses of the emergency response and this is carried forward in the analysis (although not in the conclusions - see below). The implications of these findings on future emergency responses are front-and-centre in the report as this is the central purpose of the real-time evaluation.			
<p>40 Do the conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluated object? Conclusions should give a balanced view of both the stronger aspects and weaker aspects of the evaluated object with reference to the evaluation criteria and human rights based approach.</p>	Yes				
Completeness and insight of conclusions					
<p>41 Do the conclusions represent actual insights into important issues that add value to the findings? Conclusions should go beyond findings and identify important underlying problems and/or priority issues. Simple conclusions that are already well known do not add value and should be avoided.</p>	No	The conclusions are two paragraphs that summarise the overall situation. They do not add value to the findings or take the analysis to the next level.			
<p>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).</p>	No				
<p>Executive Feedback on Section D Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>	<p>The findings section is exemplary in its structure and clarity of discussion. Evidence is well marshalled and coherently presented (although not always as complete as might be optimal). However, the almost total absence of conclusions in terms of deeper insights means that the section is unsatisfactory in terms of UNICEF standards and can not be rated confident to act.</p>				

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Relevance and clarity of recommendations				
43 Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported? Recommendations should be logically based in findings and conclusions of the report.	Outstanding	The evaluators make use of a very clear set of tables to directly link detailed recommendations to the findings. In addition to this, each section of analysis (each evaluation criterion) is immediately proceeded by around three priority actions. This makes for very clear reading and the recommendations all appear to be highly relevant.	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.	
44 Are recommendations relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation? Recommendations should be relevant to the evaluated object	Yes			Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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.	Outstanding			
Usefulness of recommendations				
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.	Outstanding	Confident to Act Recommendations are well presented, clearly prioritised, elaborated in detail, specific, appropriate, clearly linked to findings and the result of participatory learning workshops. This section would rate as outstanding if lessons learned had been correctly identified and included according to the requirements of UNEG standards.	The use of priority recommendations after each findings section complemented by a detailed table is a great example for other reports. The strength of this example is derived much more from the evaluation process itself rather than simply the layout that was chosen. All reports are expected to identify generalisable lessons learned according to UNEG standards.	
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	Outstanding			
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.	Yes			
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.	No	No lessons learned are identified. UNEG standards state that lessons learned are an integral part of any evaluation.		
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.	N/A			
Executive Feedback on Section E Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	Recommendations are not only clear and logical, but they also reflect a quality of participatory process in their development. The presentation and content are both outstanding. According to UNEG standards this should have been complemented by a section on lessons learned.			

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Style and presentation			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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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 report adopts a concise and clear style. Indeed, the tight logical structure and readability underpin most of the confidence in this report and makes up for the occasional lack of detail. The report seems to have been written with an audience in mind of UNICEF managers and partners who have been involved in the learning process and need quick access to agreed points.		
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt	Outstanding			
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	Yes			
54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?	Yes			
Executive Summary			Almost Confident to Act	
55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A	Yes	The main report itself is already very concise in areas such as background and methodology. Thus by compacting these even further the executive summary starts to risk losing important details altogether. For instance, there is no mention in the Executive Summary of the evaluation framework or the scope.		
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	Almost			
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	Almost			
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.	Almost			
Executive Feedback on Section F Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	A very well structured and accessible report style makes for a strong and usable report. This is let down a little bit by an Executive Summary that is a little too brief on some of the details that a decision maker would need if it were to stand alone.			
Additional Information				
Question	Remarks			
7/ 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 TOR calls for a real time evaluation with a dual purpose of learning and accountability. The final product certainly appears to deliver on learning, but is unable to fully respond to the accountability objective. Despite this, the evaluation report appears to reflect a participatory process that would have delivered a degree of internal accountability, even though it lacked the data on results or costs needed to demonstrate full external accountability.			

ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The participatory process appears to have been well managed so that the report reflects a final consensus shared by stakeholders, rather than having to justify each point to protect it against criticism.
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	Drawing on emergency assistance from a WASH expert from Sudan who spoke Arabic resulted in important changes to the latrine technology that was used.

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.
<p>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?</p>	Almost	<p>This reads like a good report: concepts are clearly and precisely articulated, analysis is transparent, and each section is logical. However, when looked at in detail there are some important sections that have not been fully incorporated. These include ethics, conclusions and lessons learned. The absence of these sections is problematic.</p>	<p>Almost Confident to Act</p> <p>From the information contained in the report it would appear that this evaluation constituted a very valuable learning process. The whole document holds together well, is coherent, and seems to reflect the consensus outcomes of a participatory process. Therefore, for the stakeholders who participated in the evaluation this is likely to be an excellent document: well written, clearly structured, concise, and methodical. However, from a third-party perspective it simply misses too many key elements to be considered technically satisfactory. For example, there is no presentation of the results data, lack of elaboration of objectives, a very weak conclusions section, no discussion of ethics, and no lessons learned. These are too much to overlook when rating the report overall, even though there are plenty of outstanding elements as well. The presentation of findings and recommendations, the precise scope, and the clear evaluation framework are all examples that could be used to guide other reports. Indeed the overall style was very accessible and highly commendable. Unfortunately, report style and integrity of the learning process are insufficient to rate this report as fully satisfactory according to UNICEF/UNEG standards or the dual objectives of the TOR.</p>
<p>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'.</p>	Outstanding	<p>There appear to be two real strengths to this report. The first is the way that all the analysis holds together because it has been generated through a learning process. This is reflected in the second, which is the structure of the report. Everything is arranged very clearly, is transparent and ties together well. As a result, the report encourages confidence in its findings.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	ToRs	<p>The TORs refer to the OECD DAC criteria, but then outline a clear evaluation framework and set of evaluation questions that, whilst still useful, differ from the DAC standards. The methodology section lists a number of evaluation tools rather than methodological approaches that are to be used. No requirement is made for ethics discussion or lessons learned: both of which are missing.</p>	
	Other	<p>Security issues prevented the international team member from going on all visits (although this appears not to have been a critical issue)</p>	
<p>Executive Feedback on Overall Rating Issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positives & negatives), & justify rating. <i>Up to two sentences</i></p>		<p>With a little more work this report could be used with confidence. The quality of the style, coherence, recommendations and participatory process that this report reflects makes it highly tempting to use discretion and rate it as satisfactory. However, the low use of results data, missing ethics discussion, weak conclusions section, and lack of lessons learned mean that it is not possible to do so according to both the UNICEF/UNEG standards and the accountability requirement in the TOR. The evaluation likely represented a high quality learning experience for participants, and for them this report will be useful, but it does not yet meet the standards needed to fully inform external readers.</p>	