



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	Inter-Agency Real Time Evaluation of the Humanitarian Response to Pakistan's 2009 Displacement Crisis
Report sequence number	2011/001
Date of Review	08/04/2011
Year of the Evaluation Report	2010
Region	Corporate (HQ)
Country(ies)	Pakistan
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>)	
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
Result (<i>Level of changes sought, as defined in RBM: refer to substantial use of highest level reached</i>)	4.3 Impact: Final results of a programme or policy on the intended beneficiaries and, where possible, on comparison groups. Reflects the cumulative effect of donor supported programmes of cooperation and national policy initiatives.
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>)	6.3 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.
Timing / Stage	7.2 Summative: An evaluation that examines the effects or outcomes of the object being evaluated and summarize it by describing what happened subsequent to delivery of the programme

SECTION A: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION							
Question	cc	Remarks					
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.	Yes	The humanitarian response to the 2009 displacement crisis is clearly and concisely described. Although the context is explained in rather too much detail at times, the analysis is clear and to the point, helping to illuminate the findings.	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>			
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.	Yes	The report is clearly informed by a thorough understanding of the logic of the interventions undertaken as part of the humanitarian response.	Confident to Act	The introduction to the humanitarian response to the 2009 displacement crisis is clear, complete and well illustrated. Although the context is explained in rather too much detail at times, the analysis is clear and to the point, helping to illuminate the findings.			
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				The main stakeholders and their contributions to the response are identified and described. UNICEF's response, as part of the UN team, is clearly described.		
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							
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 process of implementation and the current status of interventions are clearly described.					
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 introduction to the humanitarian response to the 2009 displacement crisis is clear, complete and well illustrated. Although the context is explained in rather too much detail at times, the analysis is clear and to the point, helping to illuminate the findings.						

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 evaluation purpose, objectives and scope are clear and realistic. The objectives and scope clearly relate to the purpose.	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>	
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>	Outstanding	The evaluation uses a list of clearly defined and relevant criteria that are relevant to the purpose of the evaluation. In the report the authors have gone to considerable lengths to define and explain the evaluation criteria and to respond to these definitions in the presentation of the findings. The report is structured around the criteria, which are used to good effect to assess the successes and challenges of implementation.	Very Confident to Act	The evaluation is guided by a clear purpose, a clearly defined set of criteria and scope. In the report the authors have gone to considerable lengths to define and explain the evaluation criteria and to structure the presentation of the findings around these criteria, which are used to good effect.	The introductory sections of the findings include clear definitions of the evaluation criteria, which is an example of good practice.
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.	Outstanding				
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 evaluation is guided by a clear purpose, a clearly defined set of criteria and scope. In the report the authors have gone to considerable lengths to define and explain the evaluation criteria and to structure the presentation of the findings around these criteria, which are used to good effect.				

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, GENDER, HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUITY				
Question	cc	Remarks		
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 and a more detailed annex explores the sampling, data collection and analysis methods. This analysis covers the selection of the data sources and their limitations.	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.	
15 Does the report specify data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations? This should include a discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure accuracy & overcome data limits	Yes			
Ethics				
16 Are ethical issues and considerations described? The design of the evaluation should contemplate: How ethical the initial design of the programme was; The balance of costs and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) in the programme and in the evaluation; The ethics of who is included and excluded in the evaluation and how this is done	No	The terms of reference and the report make no mention of ethical issues and considerations. Given the gender issues raised in particular, it would have been appropriate to put ethical safeguards in place.		Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>
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 evaluation includes a clear assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the monitoring of the humanitarian interventions. The report makes good use of the M&E framework of the interventions particularly in considering effectiveness.	Confident to Act	
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			The methodology is a well designed, appropriate response to the evaluation criteria and questions and is clearly set out in the report and in a more detailed annex. The evaluation considers gender equality in some detail and also explores issues of equity. At the same time the evaluation does not consider ethical issues or the UN commitment to a human rights based approach to programming.

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>	Almost	<p>The evaluation considers the UN's commitment to gender equality in some detail, provides an adequate consideration of equity, but does not consider a human rights based approach to programming at all. There is no mention in the report of human rights frameworks (other than as part of the cluster approach) and the report does not provide appropriate information on rights. The report does explore gender equality issues in some detail and provides a frank assessment of some of the weaknesses in the interventions. The report also considers equity issues in looking at the limited reach of some interventions for the very poorest.</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>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>	No	
<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>	Yes	
<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>	Yes	

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>	Yes	The evaluation consulted with a wide range of stakeholders at different levels and uses the information collected to good effect.
<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	
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>	N/A	The methodology is clear and well designed to respond to the evaluation criteria and questions. The methodological limitations are explored in the report and are acceptable for the evaluation.
<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 is a well designed, appropriate response to the evaluation criteria and questions and is clearly set out in the report and in a more detailed annex. The evaluation considers gender equality in some detail and also explores issues of equity. At the same time the evaluation does not consider ethical issues or the UN commitment to a human rights based approach to programming.</p>	

SECTION D: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS				
Question	Score	Remarks		
Completeness and logic of findings			<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>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>30 Are findings clearly presented and based on the objective use of the reported evidence?</p> <p>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.</p>	Outstanding	<p>The authors present the findings very effectively, providing a clear summary of the main findings, with references to the evidence and the analysis. The findings are structured around the evaluation criteria and use clear definitions of these criteria to good effect in exploring the detail of the findings. Gaps, limitations and unexpected findings are discussed throughout.</p>		
<p>31 Do the findings address all of the evaluation's stated criteria and questions?</p> <p>The findings should seek to systematically address all of the evaluation questions according to the evaluation framework articulated in the report.</p>	Outstanding			
<p>32 Do findings demonstrate the progression to results based on the evidence reported?</p> <p>There should be a logical chain developed by the findings, which shows the progression (or lack of) from implementation to results.</p>	Yes			
<p>33 Are gaps and limitations discussed?</p> <p>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.</p>	Yes			
<p>34 Are unexpected findings discussed?</p> <p>If the data reveals (or suggests) unusual or unexpected issues, these should be highlighted and discussed in terms of their implications.</p>	Yes			
Cost Analysis			<p>Confident to Act</p>	
<p>35 Is a cost analysis presented that is well grounded in the findings reported?</p> <p>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.</p>	No	<p>There is no cost analysis in the evaluation, which also does not consider efficiency.</p>		

Contribution and causality		
<p>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.</p>	Yes	The evaluation provides a fair and frank assessment of contributions to results and looks at causal reasons for both assumptions and failures. The conclusions take account of the views of a range of stakeholders.
<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	
<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 evaluation provides a frank consideration of continuing constraints, looking particularly at the relationship between the main humanitarian actors and the Pakistani government and military. The conclusions present a fair and balanced view of both the strengths and weaknesses of the humanitarian response.
<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>	Yes	The conclusions are presented at the end of each of the findings sections and provide a concise summary that add considerably to the findings. The main conclusions presented in the executive summary are clear, concise and are targeted at the main audiences of the evaluation.
<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>	Yes	
<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 authors present the findings very effectively, with clear references to the evidence and the analysis. The findings are structured around the evaluation criteria and use definitions of these criteria to good effect in exploring the detail of the findings. The evaluation provides a fair and frank assessment of the response and looks particularly at the implications of the relationship between the main humanitarian actors and the Pakistani government and military.</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.	Yes	The recommendations follow directly from the findings and conclusions in each section and are well-grounded in the evidence. The recommendations are relevant and are clearly stated. Given the complexity of the humanitarian response the recommendations are clearly prioritised.	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		
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.	Yes		
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.	Yes	Each recommendation clearly highlights the target group for action and overall the recommendations are realistic and based on a good understanding of the context. There is no description of the process for developing the recommendations.	Confident to Act The recommendations follow directly from the findings and conclusions in each section and are well-grounded in the evidence. Given the complexity of the humanitarian response the recommendations are clearly prioritised and identify targets for action throughout. The main limitation of the report is that there is only very limited consideration given to lessons learned.
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	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.	Almost	There is very limited consideration of lessons learned in the report.	
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.	Almost		
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 follow directly from the findings and conclusions in each section and are well-grounded in the evidence. Given the complexity of the humanitarian response the recommendations are clearly prioritised and identify targets for action throughout. The main limitation of the report is that there is only very limited consideration given to lessons learned.		
			Constructive feedback for future reports <i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i>

SECTION F: REPORT IS WELL STRUCTURED, LOGIC AND CLEAR				
Question	cc	Remarks		
Style and presentation			<p>F/ Overall, do all these elements come together in a well structured, logical, clear and complete report?</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Constructive feedback for future reports</p> <p><i>Including how to address weaknesses and maintaining good practice</i></p>
<p>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</p>	Yes	The opening pages and the annexes are complete. Overall the report is clearly and logically structured and is well presented.		
<p>52 Is the report logically structured? Context, purpose, methodology and findings logically structured. Findings would normally come before conclusions, recommendations & lessons learnt</p>	Yes			
<p>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</p>	Yes			
<p>54 Do the annexes increase the usefulness and credibility of the report?</p>	Yes			
Executive Summary			<p>Confident to Act</p>	
<p>55. Is an executive summary included as part of the report? If the answer is No, question 52 to 54 should be N/A</p>	Yes	The executive summary is complete and, at three pages, can stand alone and inform decision making.		
<p>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</p>	Yes			
<p>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</p>	Yes			
<p>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.</p>	Yes			
<p>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></p>	<p>The report overall is well structured, logical and easy to follow. It is well illustrated throughout and provides clear introductions and summaries. The executive summary, at three pages, is clear and can inform decision making.</p>			

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	Problems with the TOR may be noted under Overall Rating Question 3		
ii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of evaluation	The emphasis on fieldwork in the evaluation, despite the problems of security and the limited time available, is an example of good practice. The data from the fieldwork with beneficiaries is used to particularly good effect.		
iii/ Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation In terms of programmatic, sector specific, thematic expertise	The evaluation highlights the speed and effectiveness of the registration process and the use of cash and smart cards in responding to the needs of those displaced as examples of good practice.		
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?	Yes	Each of the six elements of the evaluation provide sufficient credibility to give confidence to act.	Confident to Act The evaluation is based on a clear set of recommendations, a well thought through and clearly presented methodology and a logical and clear structure for presenting the findings. Overall the report is both credible and robust and can, therefore, be used with confidence.
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 appropriate elements, but as a consistent and logical 'whole'.	Yes	The report overall is concise, logical and well put together, with the executive summary bringing the various elements together.	
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	The limitations of the terms of reference are highlighted in the feedback above.	
	Other	The report explores the main limitations with regard to performance in sufficient detail.	
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>	This report can be used with confidence. The report of the Inter-Agency Real Time Evaluation of the Humanitarian Response to Pakistan's 2009 Displacement Crisis is a clear and concise response to a well defined set of terms of reference. The evaluation is particularly noteworthy for the use of clear definitions and explanations of the evaluation criteria in the presentation of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The executive summary brings all of the main findings and recommendations together well, rounding off a credible and robust evaluation report.		