

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	Final Evaluation Report YouthLead Initiative: Most Significant Change and Lessons Learnt				
Report sequence number	2015-001	Date of Review	31-12-2015	Year of the Evaluation Report	2015
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office			Country	South Sudan
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)	2.1 UNICEF managed: Working with national partners of different categories UNICEF is responsible for all aspects of the evaluation.				
Purpose (Speaks to the overarching goal for conducting the evaluation; its raison d'être)	3.1 Pilot: Where a new solution, approach, or programme is being tested at a national or sub-national level, the evaluation examines the efficacy of such an intervention with the intention to determine suitability for scaling-up.				
Result (Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached)	4.2 Outcome: Effects from one or more programmes being implemented by multiple actors (UNICEF and others), where the cumulative effect of outputs elicits results beyond the control of any one agency or programme				
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)	5.10 Touches more than one outcome. Please specify in the comments.				The programme covers issues related to child protection, education of youth (literacy, life skills), health (HIV/AIDS), youth leadership/advocacy, entrepreneurship.
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	7.1 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.	Mostly	The object of the evaluation is very briefly described (p. 3). The description includes the purpose of the initiative, its objectives, timeframe, main stakeholders and target beneficiaries, and total budget. The specific activities implemented under the initiative and the number of target beneficiaries are not indicated in this section. The context is also very briefly explained. While it is generally related to the object evaluated, the various factors at play affecting youth issues in South Sudan are not explained in this section. Institutions policies, goals, frameworks related to youth in South Sudan are not presented. The brief context description does not illuminate the findings, e.g. there is no mention of local dynamics, i.e. tensions between ethnic groups, cattle raiding predominantly for dowries, etc. nor of the May 2013, December 2013 and December 2015 political and economic crises that are later mentioned in the findings.		
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	Mostly			
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.	No			
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	The initiative's logic model is included in Annex A but the annexes were not available for review and there is no narrative description of the logic model in the report. While the report presents the initiative's "intended results", the information presented is in fact its purpose and objectives (p. 11). There are no results statements per se. Much of the information in section 3.1 is a repetition of information in section 1.1.		
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	Yes	Key stakeholders are clearly identified (pp. 3, 12-15). The contributions/roles of UNICEF, government, donor (DFATD) stakeholders, and implementing partners (IP) and service providers (SP) are presented. Limited budget information from stakeholders is presented in the findings related to programme efficiency (p. 62).		
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	Yes			
7 Are UNICEF contributions described? This can involve financial or other contributions and should be specific	Yes			
Implementation Status				

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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>	
Mostly Satisfactory	In this section, the report provides a partial description of the object of the evaluation. The purpose and objectives are clearly stated but the specific activities supported by the initiative and intended results are not outlined. The initiative description is also divided among two sections: 1. Background; and 3. Relevant YouthLEAD Initiative Details.	Suggestions are to present all relevant descriptive information related to the object of the evaluation in one section (before the evaluation methodology), including a more detailed overview of the context in which the initiative unfolded; and provide a narrative description of the initiative's logic model/theory of change.

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

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 implementation status is described, including significant changes to strategies, notably following the May 2013, December 2013, and December 2014 crises (pp. 17-18).	
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>	In this section, the report provides a partial description of the object of the evaluation. The purpose, objectives, and stakeholders are clearly stated but the specific activities supported by the initiative and intended results are not outlined. There is no narrative description of the initiative's logic model and relevant contextual elements that would illuminate the findings are missing. Descriptive information is not all presented in one section.			

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? The purpose of the evaluation should be clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used. The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover. The report should describe and provide an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators.	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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 purpose of the evaluation is clear, including why the evaluation is needed at this time, who needs the information, what information is needed, and how the information will be used (p. 3). The objectives and scope of the evaluation are also clear (pp. 3-5). Evaluation questions are provided in the following section describing the methodology (pp. 6-7).				
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					Highly satisfactory	The report's clear description of the purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation reflects good practice except an evaluation matrix included in annex would add value to the overall 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. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	Yes	The report provides a list of relevant evaluation criteria which are the standard OECD-DAC criteria (pp. 3, 6-7). It explains why the efficiency criterion is only partially covered (p. 3).				
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.	Yes					
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 report presents a clear description of the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope. This is reflective of good practice. However, an evaluation matrix with indicators and data collection methods and sources for each evaluation question is not included.					

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY				
Question	cc	Remarks	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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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	The report specifies data collection, analysis, and sampling methods and indicates how many people were interviewed and participated in focus groups (pp. 4-5, 7-9).		
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	Tools are referred to in Annex D but could not be verified due to the unavailability of the annexes for review. Data sources and the rationale for their selection are mentioned with primary and secondary sources consulted included in Annexes C and G. It is not clear however who among the interviewed participants was represented in the 168 MSC narratives and stories collected.		
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	The report makes limited reference to ethical issues in the analysis related to UNICEF's Do No Harm policy which the evaluators state was not respected in one of the programme's components by excluding Toposa and other youth in economic development activities (pp. 22, 55-56). Ethical issues and safeguards related to the evaluation itself are not mentioned in the report. Confidentiality of informants seems somewhat problematic as several quotes throughout the report identify the names of the informants.		
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	No			
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 the evaluated object's M&E system is adequately and critically assessed (pp. 6, 9, 18, 22-23, 27, 32, 35, 38, 46-48, 50, 64, 76-77). The evaluation used logic model targets to assess the initiative's effectiveness.		
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.	Yes			

Human Rights, Gender and Equity			Highly satisfactory
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 report refers briefly to relevant MDGs, UNDAF key targets, and the child protection issues of particular concern to UNICEF (pp. 11, 38). Gender equality and equity issues are adequately addressed throughout (pp. 3, 7, 11, 16-17, 19, 21, 25, 38, 40-42, 54, 65, 74-75, 77-79).	
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.	Yes		
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.	Yes	The levels and activities of stakeholder consultation are described and the description goes beyond using stakeholders as sources of information (pp. 6, 9-10). However, the report notes limited availability of UNICEF, IP and SP staff "to support the evaluation process" (p. 9). While the evaluation team states it tried several times to engage DFATD, the main funder of the initiative, DFATD staff were reportedly unavailable (p. 10). The levels of participation of other stakeholders are appropriate for the task at hand but, clearly, a higher degree of participation by key stakeholders and some level of participation by DFATD would have been preferable.		
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.	Yes			
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.	N/A	There is no attempt to construct a counterfactual in the context of this evaluation given the use of the most significant change method. The evaluation tried to measure "the nature of the change that has taken place in the lives of youth, and its significance on their development, by using the Most Significant Change method as the main tool" (pp. 3-4) combined with other data collection methods. The MSC method in and of itself is not a rigorous evaluation tool to address issues of attribution especially used one-off as in the context of this evaluation. Moreover, as mentioned, it is not clear whose narratives and stories are reflected through this method.		
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.	Mostly			
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	Mostly			
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>	The methodology used is generally appropriate and sound. The capability and robustness of the evaluated object's M&E system is adequately and critically assessed and human rights, gender equality, and equity issues are adequately addressed. The limited monitoring of program activities/results and availability of stakeholder representatives are identified as evaluation challenges.			

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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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	The findings are clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence (pp. 16-72). Findings on results clearly distinguish outputs, outcomes, and impacts. They address all of the evaluation's criteria and questions and demonstrate the progression from implementation to results. Gaps and limitations are discussed and caveats included (e.g. pp. 26, 38, 42-43, 61). Unexpected programme outcomes are discussed (pp. 55-56, 63).		
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: 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.	N/A	The report does not present a cost analysis per se only a general breakdown of budget per outcome per year (p. 62). The report states the evaluation team did not receive detailed financial reports from the programme (p. 61). The use of the most significant change method is usually not linked to detailed cost analyses.		

Contribution and causality			Highly satisfactory
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 evaluation makes a fair and reasonable attempt to assign contribution for results to identified stakeholders (e.g. pp. 24-25, 30, 32, 34-47). Causal reasons for accomplishments and failures are clearly identified throughout the findings.	
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. <i>(This is an extremely important question to UNICEF)</i>	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	The future implications of continuing constraints are discussed (e.g. pp. 31, 47-50, 64). The conclusions present both the strengths and weaknesses of the programme (pp. 73-78).	
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.	Yes	The conclusions sum up the findings well and provide insights into important issues that add value to the findings. They take due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders in keeping with the findings reported. They are pitched at a level that is relevant to the end users of the evaluation.	
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).	Yes		
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>	The findings and conclusions are clearly presented, relevant, and based on evidence and sound analysis. They are organized in accordance with the evaluation criteria and address all of the evaluation questions which is reflective of good practice.		

SECTION E: RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED						
Question		cc	Remarks		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 <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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.	Yes	The recommendations are well-grounded in the evidence and conclusions reported (pp. 78-81). They are relevant to the object and the purpose of the evaluation. While clearly stated they are not prioritized.				
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.	Mostly					
Usefulness of recommendations					Mostly Satisfactory	Each recommendation should explicitly identify the target group for action and level of priority. Lessons learned should also be generalized to indicate wider relevance.
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.	Mostly	Some recommendations clearly identify the target group for action but not all. They are realistic in the context of the evaluation. The report does not describe the process followed in developing the recommendations.				
47 Are the recommendations realistic in the context of the evaluation? his includes: o an understanding of the commissioning organisation o awareness of the implementation constraints o an understanding of the follow-up processes	Yes					
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.	No	The lessons learned presented are not correctly identified as they do not indicate wider relevance beyond the context of the programme evaluated (pp. 22, 48-50, 56-57, 60-61). Moreover, they are worded like conclusions which results in some repetition of information.				
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					
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>		The recommendations are relevant and grounded in the evidence presented but they are not prioritized and some do not clearly identify the target group for action. The lessons learned do not indicate wider relevance as they are worded like conclusions.				

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?	Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
			The opening pages contain most of the basic elements except the title page does not indicate the timeframe of the programme covered by the evaluation and there is no list of tables and figures after the table of contents. The report is logically structured for the most part, although descriptive information with respect to the programme is divided among two sections: section 1.1 entitled The YouthLEAD Initiative and chapter 3 entitled Relevant YouthLEAD Initiative Details with the evaluation purpose and methodology in between. The lessons learned with respect to the findings related to each evaluation criterion are presented at the end of each relevant section in the findings chapter instead of grouped together after the report's conclusions in chapter 6 entitled Conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations. The annexes contain appropriate elements except and evaluation matrix is missing. The list of annexes indicates they increase the usefulness and credibility of the report but the annexes were not available for review.	Overall, all the elements come together in a mostly well structured, logical, and clear report. Some structural issues have been noted as well as a few missing elements that preclude this report from being deemed complete. The executive summary is lacking a proper overview of the programme and is too long to effectively inform decision making.	
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		Mostly			
52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt		Mostly			
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			
			Mostly Satisfactory		
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			An executive summary is included as part of the report. It contains some of the necessary elements but is missing a few key pieces of information such as an overview of the programme in the introduction, including the time period of programme implementation. It is too long (14 pages) to effectively inform decision making.
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		No			
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		No			
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.		No			
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>		This is a mostly well structured, logical, and clear report. Some descriptive elements regarding the programme are broken up between sections and would be better grouped in one section to strengthen logical flow. We also suggest extracting lessons learned from the findings chapter and grouping them after the overall conclusions. The executive summary should also be revised to inform decision making.			
Additional Information					
Question		Remarks			

i/ Does the evaluation successfully address the Terms of Reference? If the report does not include a TOR then a recommendation should be given to ensure that all evaluations include the TOR in the future. Some evaluations may be flawed because the TORs are inappropriate, too little time etc. Or, they may succeed despite inadequate TORs. This should be noted under vii in the next section		The ToR appear to have been included in Annex B: Request for Proposals but annexes were not available for review.		
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice in the evaluation In terms of evaluation		Some aspects of good practice in the evaluation are: clear description of the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope; and the organization of the findings and conclusions in accordance with the evaluation criteria and questions.		
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise		The report identifies some programmatic good practices such as: vocational training which offered participants a chance to learn a second skill (p. 49); traditional trainings on child protection and gender (p. 74); and reference to international lessons learned that provide "specific measures to attract and include special groups at risk" but that were not considered in the context of this evaluation (p. 79).		
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 six sections of the evaluation provide some but not full credibility to give the reasonable person confidence to act.	Mostly Satisfactory	This is a fairly credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence. It can therefore be used with limited confidence, noting the following gaps: the partial description of the initiative and its context at the beginning of the report, the absence of an evaluation matrix, recommendations that are not explicitly prioritized and targeted to specific stakeholders, lessons learned that do not indicate wider relevance, and an executive summary that does not effectively inform decision making.
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'.	Mostly	The six sections hold together in a somewhat but not fully logically consistent way throughout the report.		
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. <i>Up to two sentences</i>	The main gaps of this report are: the partial description of the initiative and its context at the beginning of the report, the absence of an evaluation matrix, recommendations that are not explicitly prioritized and targeted to specific stakeholders, lessons learned that do not indicate wider relevance, and an executive summary that does not effectively inform decision making. On a more positive note, the report adequately addresses gender equality and equity issues and provides a balanced analysis of the data reported and relevant recommendations that relate to the evaluation's objectives.			