## Executive Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the evaluation</th>
<th>Zimbabwe’s Harmonised Social Cash Transfer Programme: Endline Impact Evaluation Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence No</td>
<td>2018/001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>ESAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Type</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Report</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL RATING

- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Satisfactory

**Implications:** Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence

### SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Satisfactory

**The object of the evaluation is clearly described and the report explains the initiative’s intended results and provides a coherent Theory of Change that explains the relations of causality and differentiates immediate outcomes from impact. This being said, the evaluation does not provide enough information on the longer-term commitment of UNICEF in the country and the relative importance of this initiative within that context. The report correctly identifies the main stakeholders involved in the programme and describes their roles and contributions, both financial and in kind.**

### SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)

- [ ] [ ] [ ] Fair

**The purpose of the evaluation appears to be realistic and is stated as learning about the programming effects on recipients and providing evidence for making decisions about the future of the programme. However, the report does not sufficiently specify the intended use of the evaluation and does not identify who the intended users will be. Also, the report does not make reference to any changes made to the ToRs and could discuss in more depth what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process in terms of institutional learning.**

### SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

- [ ] [ ] [ ] Satisfactory
The impact evaluation uses a standard counterfactual design. The report provides a good description of methods used, and a comparative analysis between surveys and data at different stages of the intervention is clearly presented. Also, the report describes the sources of information and the sampling strategies used. Although the report discusses the attrition cases related to the availability of data, limitations to the evaluation and mitigation strategies could be addressed in more depth. While the evaluation makes reference to the ethical safeguards for participants according to UNEG norms and standards, the obligations of the evaluators are not discussed.

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

Satisfactory

Findings are clearly presented according to thematic areas. The evaluation presents both positive and negative findings and these are supported by robust and clearly presented data. Causal factors are discussed to explain success or failure and the evaluation makes abundant reference to the initiative's M&E system, as per the ToRs. On the other hand, the evaluation could make more explicit reference to the results frameworks of each programme to help better frame the evaluation results.

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)

Fair

The conclusions are logically derived from the information presented in the findings, provide an added value in terms of insight and are in general forward-looking. They make reference to both positive aspects of the initiative as well as current challenges. On the other hand, lessons learned are not presented in the report.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Highly Satisfactory

Recommendations stem logically from the information discussed in the findings and conclusions. Each recommendation is clearly presented and indicates the target group for action in every case, and directions as to what the next steps should be are provided. The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations and the participation of key stakeholders in this process.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

The opening pages of the report include all necessary information, i.e. name of the object of the evaluation, as well as its geographic and chronological coverage, date of the report, names of the evaluators and the commissioning organisation, etc. Similarly, the annexes include a number of central elements, such as the ToRs, additional information on the methodology, tools and literature that add to the credibility of the report. On the other hand, the overall structure does not follow the standard order of sections of evaluation reports which makes its navigation challenging.
SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Satisfactory

The evaluation makes reference to the importance of fulfilling the obligation of respecting the most vulnerable population’s basic rights. Even though equity, gender equality and human rights are not included as transversal evaluation criteria, the initiative’s main focus is on the most vulnerable groups in Zimbabwe and the evaluation addresses the extent to which the initiative's design and implementation used an equity and GEEW perspective. On the other hand, the evaluation could explain in more detail the level of stakeholder involvement in the different stages of the evaluation as well as demonstrate a more gender sensitive methodology.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

The executive summary provides an overview of the main elements covered by the evaluation such as a brief description of the initiative, the study design and main findings and recommendations. However, the intended audience and use of the evaluation are not discussed and more information on the context surrounding the initiative is needed.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

| 4 | Approaches requirements |

Recommendations for improvement

This evaluation contains valuable information and can be used with confidence by decision-makers. However, some areas for improvement include a more explicit explanation of the way the evaluation is to be used and who the primary users will be; the overall structure of the report could be enhanced by rearranging the way some sections and subsections are presented, i.e. purpose of the evaluation, methodology, as well as by including lessons learned. Finally, it is recommended that a results framework be presented in order to better guide the reader as to the overall nature of the intervention and to help frame the evaluation findings.

Lessons for managing future evaluations:

This section observes good practices in general. However, the evaluation could provide more information on the longer-term commitment of UNICEF in the country and the relative importance of this initiative within that context. This would help the reader to better situate and contextualize the object of evaluation and the importance of the evaluation.

Section A

It is important to clearly indicate the intended use of the evaluation and who its primary and secondary users will be. Also, it is good practice to discuss in further depth what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process. Finally, it is suggested that the report make reference to any changes that may have been made to the ToRs.
Section C
It is recommended that a sub section be included where limitations to the evaluation and
the mitigation strategies used in each case could be addressed in a more systematic
way. It is also important that the ethical obligations of the evaluators be explicitly
discussed in the report, as outlined in the UNEG Ethical Standards found at:
http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102

Section D
It is good practice to discuss the evaluation's results framework as this provides a clear
structure around which the findings can be presented.

Section E
It is good practice to produce lessons learned, if possible, that are drawn from the
evidence collected through the evaluation process. These lessons learned can constitute
a contribution to institutional knowledge and must therefore be correctly generalised so
as to maximise their usefulness in other areas and different contexts.

Section F
This section observes good practices. No further improvement is required.

Section G
The overall structure of the evaluation report could be enhanced by organising the
different elements of the report under more standard sections and subsections. For
example, it is recommended that the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation be
grouped together under the same section. Similarly, the methodology, sampling and data
collection tools should ideally be grouped under one section. Finally, the table of contents
should preceed the executive summary and list of acronyms.

Section H
It is good practice to discuss in detail the level of stakeholder involvement in the different
stages of the evaluation, as requested in the ToRs. This can help to reflect the extent to
which the evaluation drew on multiple perspectives as well as the level of stakeholder
ownership in the evaluation. Also, it is important to include gender-sensitive evaluation
questions and to explicitly discuss how data collection tools ensured that women's voices
will be heard in the evaluation process. To learn more about how to conduct a gender
sensitive evaluation, please see:

Section I
The executive summary should be understood as an overview of the most important
elements of the evaluation that allows end users to be sufficiently informed about both
the initiative and the evaluation results. Within the executive summary, it is important to
include a description of the country context as well as information on the intended
audience and use the evaluation. For more information on how to produce an executive
summary, please visit