

EVALUATION REPORT

UNICEF STRATEGIC PLAN, 2014-2017 EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

Final Report

Annexes

EVALUATION OFFICE
July 2015



UNICEF STRATEGIC PLAN, 2014-2017 EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT

Final Report

Annexes

Contents

- Annex 1 Evaluability assessment inception report
- Annex 2 Document review/extraction templates
- Annex 3 Documents reviewed
- Annex 4 Individuals interviewed
- Annex 5 Strategic Plan characteristics
- Annex 6 Questions on Theory of Change evidence base
- Annex 7 Summary of assumptions by Strategic Plan outcome
- Annex 8 Indicator analyses
- Annex 9 Regional office priorities (as per Regional Office Management Plans)
- Annex 10 Management response

Annex 1

Evaluability assessment inception report

UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017
Evaluability Assessment
Inception Report

Contents

I.	Introduction	5
II.	Inception phase.....	5
III.	Emerging issues arising from the inception phase.....	6
IV.	Objectives of the evaluability assessment	8
V.	Conducting the evaluability assessment: Approaches, methods and sources	15
VI.	Work plan.....	20
VII.	Limitations.....	21
VIII.	Conclusion	22

Annexes

Annex 1	Terms of reference for an evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (original)
Annex 2	Documents and materials reviewed
Annex 3	Individuals interviewed
Annex 4	Evaluability assessment matrix
Annex 5	Evaluability criteria defined and data collection instruments
Annex 6	Countries presenting programmes for approval to the Executive Board 2015
Annex 7	Protocol for regional office visits
Annex 8	Outline for evaluability assessment final report
Annex 9	Timeline (November 2014-February 2015)
Annex 10	Longer responses to issues raised by reviewers

Acronyms

CCC	Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action
CEE/CIS	Central and Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States
COAR	Country Office Annual Report
CPD	country programme document
CPAP	country programme action plan
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
EAPRO	East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office
ESARO	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
LACRO	Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office
LMI	lower middle income
MENARO	Middle East and North Africa Regional Office
MoRES	Monitoring Results for Equity System
MTR	mid-term review of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017
MTSP	medium-term strategic plan, 2006-2013
QCPR	Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review
RAM	Results Assessment Module
ROSA	Regional Office for South Asia
SMQ	Strategic Monitoring Questions
UMI	upper middle income
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
WCARO	West and Central Africa Regional Office

I. Introduction

As mandated by the United Nations General Assembly, UNICEF advocates for the protection of children's rights, helps meet their basic needs and expands their opportunities to reach their full potential. To guide the organization in implementing this mission, UNICEF has developed the Strategic Plan, 2014-2017, which the Executive Board approved in September 2013. The Strategic Plan 2014-2017 builds on lessons learned from the implementation of the medium-term strategic plan 2006-2013 (MTSP).

The Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 is rooted in the UNICEF commitment to equity, which means that all children have an opportunity to survive, develop and reach their full potential, without discrimination, bias or favouritism. At the highest level of impact, the Strategic Plan seeks to realize the rights of every child, especially the most disadvantaged. Seven outcome areas encompassing major aspects of child well-being, are envisioned to converge in support of the realization of child rights, especially the most disadvantaged and excluded. Underlying the outcomes is a common set of outputs and implementation strategies.

At this early stage of Strategic Plan implementation, UNICEF seeks to conduct an evaluability assessment of the Strategic Plan. Broadly stated, an evaluability assessment is defined as a review of a proposed activity in order to determine whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable. As applied to the Strategic Plan, an evaluability assessment will provide assurance to UNICEF management and stakeholders that the Strategic Plan is robust, that its indicators are validated and measurable, and that systems are in place to measure and verify them. Conducting the exercise in the first year of the programme cycle will allow UNICEF to strengthen, where necessary, the systems needed to measure, monitor and evaluate progress toward results.

This report describes an inception period, including the activities undertaken and the emerging findings. It also outlines an approach to conducting the evaluability assessment.

II. Inception phase

The inception phase (August-September 2014) provided the two-person consultant team with an opportunity to gain a more critical understanding of UNICEF's expectations for the evaluability assessment. The overall objective for the inception phase was to fully elaborate an approach for the evaluability assessment that is responsive to the priority needs of stakeholders and feasible given available time and resources. The original terms of reference for the assignment appear in Annex 1 of the inception report.

The initial step in the inception phase was to examine the literature on evaluability assessments and on assessing theories of change. Documents were identified and drawn from peer-reviewed sources, grey literature and guidance notes. From these sources, several take away messages were used to inform the approach to the evaluability assessment of the Strategic Plan. These include:

- Definitions of evaluability assessment vary across the documentation. A simple construct of evaluability uses two complementary elements: evaluability 'in principle', based on the internal logic of a programme, as represented by its theory of change; and evaluability 'in practice', as represented by the measurement approach, tools and

indicators used to reflect performance and results achieved. These dimensions were found to be relevant and useful to the current assignment.

- Checklists are commonly used and potentially useful tools for assessing evaluability. Checklists are appealing in that they can identify and cover a range of relevant issues in a consistent manner. Particularly when used with a rating and detailed notation, a checklist approach would allow consistent coverage between the Strategic Plan's outcomes.
- While there is no consensus on a single definition of 'theory of change', there is agreement around the components as follows. The *change* to be achieved should be articulated through: a) the context, including social, political and environmental conditions, the current state of the problem and other actors able to influence change; b) the long-term change sought and for whose ultimate benefit; c) the process/sequence of the change anticipated to lead to the desired long-term outcome with an explicit cause-and-effect relationship; d) the assumptions about how these changes might happen (i.e. they are the 'theories' in theory of change thinking) as a check on whether activities and outputs are appropriate for influencing change in the desired direction in this context; and e) the diagram and narrative summary that captures outcomes.

Additional inception phase methods included a desk-based review of key documents, particularly the Strategic Plan and associated documents (i.e. results framework and Theory of Change document), as well as literature on conducting evaluability assessments and appraising theories of change (*see Annex 2*). The team visited UNICEF Headquarters (Beth Ann Plowman: 16-26 September; Philip Setel: 16-23 September), which allowed for discussion with the Evaluation Office, interaction with the reference group guiding the evaluability assessment, interviews with stakeholders throughout the organization, orientation on internal results reporting systems, and identification of additional resources. Interviews were conducted using a discussion guide and responses were collated by question and sub-themes. Individuals interviewed appear in Annex 3.

Drawing on these steps, this inception report highlights emerging findings, clarifies objectives and key questions and describes the approach, methods and tools for conducting the evaluability assessment. This report is submitted for the consideration of the Evaluation Office and will be adjusted based on feedback. The inception phase will conclude with an agreed approach upon which the evaluability assessment can move into the development phase.

III. Emerging issues arising from the inception phase

This section provides high-level findings from stakeholder interviews conducted during the inception phase and reference group discussion. Quotations are used in cases where a single respondent succinctly articulated widely held opinions. In this manner, quotations serve an illustrative purpose. The section is structured to provide insight on emerging findings for the following:

- The utility of the evaluability assessment from the stakeholders' point of view
- Key issues to be examined from the stakeholders' point of view

In interviews, stakeholders were asked: "In terms of its scope, what would make this evaluability assessment most useful to you?" Responses clustered around a core set of uses. Chief among these was the opportunity to make corrections. For example, the reference group

discussion started with members asking about the leeway for change if it is found that certain logic chains are not as robust as they might be. There was open acknowledgement that the Strategic Plan could benefit from a careful review. Specifically, many respondents suggested that the evaluability assessment generate concrete and practical recommendations on fixes that may be needed.

Discussion also focused on the fact that the evaluability assessment is being conducted early in the implementation cycle, thereby facilitating its use for making adjustments. Many respondents focused on an anticipated Mid-Term Review of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (MTR), tentatively planned for December 2015, as an opportunity to make those needed adjustments. These discussions provided the team with important insight into uses of the evaluability assessment, not only to inform future evaluation but also to contribute to making adjustments to the Strategic Plan.

Many respondents noted that the Theory of Change document is a first for UNICEF and a careful review emphasizing clarity, logic and consistency would be beneficial. Finally, respondents saw real utility in using the evaluability assessment to examine the indicators and assess the underlying systems. One illustrative quote of this opinion was the following: “Assessing capacities is most critical: do we have the capacity to establish and maintain strong monitoring systems?”

In sum, it was reiterated that the evaluability assessment will highlight gaps and weaknesses with indicators (‘in practice’) and design issues (‘in principle’) and will thus be used to improve both. It was further suggested that the assessment should be very practical in identifying where fixes may be needed.

Respondents were also asked to identify key issues for inclusion in the evaluability assessment. They were asked the question: “From your perspective, are there key issues that should be addressed in this evaluability assessment? If so, could you please describe those?” While answers were diverse, a commonly cited set of issues included equity, crosscutting issues and the translation of the Strategic Plan into country programmes.

Challenges related to measuring equity were consistently mentioned. Some respondents pointed to country-specific identification of the most disadvantaged and the resulting difficulty in aggregating across countries. Others described a dilemma related to reaching an agreed definition of equity, for example, whether equity refers to targeting the most marginalized or narrowing the gap. The team was consistently directed to the recently conducted evaluation of the Monitoring Results in Equity System (MoRES) as essential reading.

The Strategic Plan’s priority crosscutting areas – gender equality and humanitarian action – were also identified as important to assess. While both are integrated as outputs, the team was briefed on the differing paths that brought them into the Strategic Plan. In the area of humanitarian action, many respondents pointed out the Strategic Plan’s attention to linkages between development and disaster. Resilience was cited as an important theme in the Strategic Plan but one not yet sufficiently understood and therefore very difficult to attempt to measure. Others pointed to the humanitarian action indicators and questioned whether they adequately capture UNICEF’s work.

Finally, how the Strategic Plan will be translated into country-specific programming emerged as an important issue. The Strategic Plan, as an overall framework, will need to be translated into country plans of cooperation with differing emphasis on outcomes and outputs depending

on the country situation and setting, both of which drive UNICEF country programmes. Many pointed to the pace with which the Strategic Plan will become visible in country programme documents (CPDs). The CPDs submitted through September 2014 were in the process of being prepared before the Strategic Plan was approved. The MTSP still serves as the framework for those documents. The CPDs that will be submitted in 2015 will begin to demonstrate alignment with the Strategic Plan. As a result, the team cannot examine CPDs submitted in 2014 and will rely instead on those currently in preparation for 2015 submission. Likewise, the assessment of evaluability in practice will be limited by the pace of the rollout of newly created reporting systems.

In sum, the team found a very high degree of agreement among stakeholders on the objectives of the evaluability assessment, its utility for them and priority issues.

IV. Objectives of the evaluability assessment

The evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan is structured around the following five objectives:

1. Assess the clarity, relevance and coherence of the Strategic Plan's design, including the integrity of the causal chain linking inputs and activities with expected outputs, outcomes and impact.
2. Assess the adequacy and validity of the indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results; and the adequacy and quality of data to be used in monitoring, measuring and evaluating results, including any significant gaps in coverage.
3. Assess systems and data to determine the degree to which human and financial resources can be evaluated against the expected results.
4. Generate guidance on approaches to the evaluations of the Strategic Plan with a view to enhancing its utility.
5. Generate evidence and recommendations to guide any enhancements, which may be required regarding the design of the Strategic Plan and arrangements for its implementation.

The following section provides brief descriptions of each of the study's five objectives. The descriptions cover the key questions, sources and methods through which the objective will be addressed, as well as any departures from the original terms of reference. The information presented here also appears in tabular form in an evaluability assessment matrix (see *Annex 4*).

Objective 1: Assess the clarity, relevance and coherence of the Strategic Plan's design, including the integrity of the causal chain linking inputs and activities with expected outputs, outcomes and impact.

The team will answer the following six questions related to this objective:

- 1.1 How relevant is the Strategic Plan in relation to UNICEF's charter documents?
- 1.2 To what extent do the Strategic Plan, Theory of Change and results framework present a clear causal chain?
- 1.3 How plausible and testable are the Theory of Change and associated results, indicators and activities?
- 1.4 How well have key assumptions, risks and mitigation strategies been specified?
- 1.5 What are the issues pertaining to the evaluability, in principle, of crosscutting priorities (gender equality and humanitarian action); normative principles (i.e. gender equality, humanitarian action, environmental sustainability, human rights); and the agency's focus on equity?
- 1.6 What are the opportunities and challenges related to translating the Strategic Plan into country programmes of cooperation?

A diverse set of source materials is needed to answer these questions. The relevance of the Strategic Plan will be examined in relation to UNICEF's charter documents and commitments (question 1.1), as articulated in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs), the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR), and the UNICEF mission statement. The Strategic Plan, the Theory of Change and the results framework will be examined in order to answer questions 1.2-1.5. These sources will be bolstered with interviews to be conducted during the development phase of the evaluability assessment. Interviews will be a primary input into the assessment of challenges in translating the Strategic Plan into country programmes of cooperation (question 1.6). Additional source documents to be consulted include the Gender Action Plan, the MoRES Evaluation, the Humanitarian Performance Monitoring Toolkit, draft CPDs where relevant, and CPD Guidance.

The methods will vary to some degree, depending on the questions above. For example, the relevance of the Strategic Plan to charter documents will be assessed through an exercise of mapping Strategic Plan outcomes onto the content (e.g. sections/articles) of documents such as the CRC, CCC and QCPR. In addition, the content of the Strategic Plan and related documents will be analysed by assessing these against a set of best practice criteria drawn primarily from literature and United Nations Development Group (UNDG) guidance.¹ Descriptions of the main criteria appear below in Table 1.

The consultants will review the content of documents using two templates shown in Annex 5 (specifically, the evaluability in principle and Theory of Change and suitability of indicators tools).

In order to complete the evaluability in principle template, the team will review the relevant sections of the Strategic Plan, Theory of Change and results framework (as well as supplementary and revised indicators) against each of the evaluability criteria. This review will focus on the impact and outcome levels. Based on that review, the team will draft a short narrative relying on the stated logic and a structured assessment of how well each of the criteria has been met, pointing to specific content contained within the documents. The Theory of Change and indicator suitability tables will be based on a review of the Theory of Change at all levels from output to impact and all relevant indicators at each level.

¹ UNDG guidance on results-based management is aimed at country-level programming. Therefore, its use as a comparator in this evaluability assessment is limited.

Table 1. Criteria to assess questions logic and causal chains

Evaluability criteria	Answers the question
Relevance and clarity	Are the Theory of Change components clearly relevant to the needs of the target group, as identified by any form of situation analysis, baseline study or other evidence and argument? Is the intended beneficiary group clearly identified? Are the elements of the Theory of Change clearly identified and are the proposed steps towards achieving these clearly defined?
Plausibility and testability	Is there a continuous causal chain connecting outputs and outcomes to the final impact of concern? Is it possible to identify which linkages in the causal chain will be most critical to the success of the strategy, and thus should be the focus of evaluation questions?
Validity	Are there valid indicators for each expected event (output, outcome and impact levels)? That is, will they capture what is expected to happen?
Context	Have assumptions about the roles of other actors outside of UNICEF been made explicitly (both enablers and constrainers)? Are there plausible plans to monitor these in any practicable way?
Agreement	To what extent are different stakeholders holding different views about the strategy objectives and how they will be achieved?

First, the logic of each result (i.e. the impact, outcome and output statements) will be condensed into a series of 'if/then' statements based upon content analysis of the relevant Theory of Change section. This includes reference to the subsections of the Theory of Change document pertaining to: the rationale for focusing on the programme area; key areas of work; and key assumptions, risks and mitigation measures. Second, the team will compare the content of each group of indicators to the logic of the results statement in order to assess the suitability of indicators in aggregate to measure the progress of the result. This tool is viewed as the basis for structured dialogue with each of the thematic/outcome areas in order to address issues related to the integrity of the causal chain.

The systematic narratives generated from the use of these tools, combined with interview data, will be discussed with outcome owners and supplemented as needed through stakeholder interviews. Findings from this process will then be synthesized into the narrative for the evaluability assessment report itself.

Through application of these methods, the team feels confident that Objective 1 can be achieved.

Objective 2: Assess the adequacy and validity of the indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results; and the adequacy and quality of data to be used in monitoring, measuring and evaluating results, including any significant gaps in coverage.

The team proposes to address this objective by examining the following seven questions related to the indicators of the results framework:

- 2.1 Are indicators in place? Have the indicators been defined (e.g. numerators and denominators) with clearly understood standards? How reliably can the indicator be measured given specifications in the results framework and indicator sheets?
- 2.2 Are baselines in place for indicators?
- 2.3 Has a target value for the indicator been provided, including for any necessary

- stratification (e.g. age and sex)?
- 2.4 Have specific sources of information been identified for the indicators?
 - 2.5 Is a data generating system in place with defined responsibilities, sources and periodicity and a means of verifying the quality of information generated through those sources?
 - 2.6 In logical/conceptual terms, how close is the indicator to the impact, outcome or output statement? Do the indicators adequately reflect the result to be achieved?
 - 2.7 Are measures, tools and mechanisms in place to measure crosscutting priorities (e.g. gender equality) and normative principles?

In order to answer these questions, a core set of source material will be examined. During the inception visit, the team was able to identify and discuss changes made to the endorsed indicators at both outcome and output levels (23 of 167 were altered). In addition, staff in each outcome area generated a set of supplemental indicators that they believe are necessary additions to strengthen the results chain. The supplemental indicators will not be reported to the Executive Board but will be collected and used internally. The evaluability assessment will consider this revised set of indicators and the supplemental indicators as the operative list. Finally, the outcome owners have recently completed detailed indicator sheets. These sheets provide indicator definitions and methods of calculation, descriptions of sources and notes on frequency of updating and means of target setting.

The primary method of assessing indicators will be the use of a checklist with eight criteria, as shown in Table 2. As with Objective 1 methods, these criteria have been extracted from the literature on the evaluability assessment and theories of change. The final set of criteria was crosschecked with the UNDG technical briefs, which supplement the UNDG Results-Based Management Handbook, for agreement.

Table 2: Criteria to assess strategic plan and supplemental indicators

Criteria	Answers the question
Indicator defined	Has the indicator been defined (e.g. numerator and denominator)? Are there standards defined that gauge acceptable quantities and qualities?
Measurability	How reliably can the indicator be measured given specifications in the results framework and indicator sheets?
Baseline specified	Has a baseline measure been provided for the indicator, including for any necessary stratification?
Target specified	Has a target value for the indicator been provided, including for any necessary stratification?
System or source identified	Has a specific source or system been identified to collect the indicator?
Quality	Has the data quality been verified through either internal or external checks?
Proximity	In logical/conceptual terms, how close is the indicator to the impact, outcome or output statement?
Pertains to crosscutting priority	Does the indicator pertain to equity ('E'), humanitarian situations ('H'), or gender equality ('G')

All criteria other than measurability and proximity can be objectively assessed through document review. For measurability and proximity, no purely objective assessment can be made. Furthermore, the team believes that use of a binary 'yes' or 'no' judgment applied to measurability or proximity would oversimplify the matter. Therefore, the team will use the categories of red, yellow and green. For measurability, red denotes poorly constructed indicators, those framed in an un-measurable manner or those for which measurability remains unclear even from the specifications provided. Yellow refers to indicators with a weak specification or source or those dependent on subjective assessment (e.g. by a country office staff person). Finally, green refers to indicators that are clear or standard and easily measured using well-established practice. For proximity, red refers to indicators that are conceptually distal to the result, and where there are intervening steps in the logic chain. Yellow refers to indicators that are proximate to the result but may have a long lag time before they can be measured. Lastly, green denotes that an indicator is proximate to the result and does not have a long lag time before it can be measured.

The process of completing the checklist will be conducted through the following steps:

- a) Structured assessment to generate an initial finding;
- b) A 'checking back' discussion with outcome owners focused on initial findings, for additions, corrections and clarification;
- c) Key informant interviews to provide any missing information; and
- d) A finalizing synthesis across these methods.

A second method for answering these questions is to diagram the information systems that will be used to generate the results data. These two systems include the strategic monitoring questions (SMQs) annex to the country office annual reports (COARs) and the Results Assessment Module (RAM) of the Insight information system. The diagrams will depict the flow of information from source to results reporting, highlighting quality review steps.

For the Strategic Plan, indicators exist at the levels of impact, outcomes and outputs. The team proposes differentiated approaches based on level. At the level of impact and outcome indicators, the team proposes to examine all impact and outcome measures using a light review. A light review is justified by two factors. First, at these levels, the indicators are largely agreed to by inter-agency working groups or other normative bodies and data sources and quality is well established. Second, at the impact and outcome levels, results are achieved through the joint efforts of many actors and are well beyond UNICEF's direct accountability. The team proposes a more substantial review, utilizing the checklist above, for the output level indicators. The primary reason deals with UNICEF's more direct accountability for the output-level results. Because the overall number of output indicators is substantial (105 indicators not including those considered supplemental), the team has made a strategic selection of 30 output indicators. The set includes indicators from each outcome area (e.g. health, nutrition, child protection) and from each output area (e.g. supply, demand, enabling environment). Within each output area, the team mapped indicators by intended change and selected with an eye for diverse results and measurability issues.

Through application of these methods, the team feels confident that Objective 2 will be met with the caveat that some but not all output indicators will be examined for adequacy and validity.

Objective 3: Assess systems and data to determine the degree to which human and financial

resources can be evaluated against the expected results

Objective 3 of the original terms of reference has been replaced with the above. The version from the terms of reference was stated as: “an assessment of the extent to which human and financial resource allocations are adequate to achieve expected results; and whether sufficient human and financial resources are allocated to support adequate monitoring, evaluating and reporting on results.”

The rationale for the change is based, in part, on interviews carried out during the inception phase. Respondents pointed to a number of difficulties and challenges related to conducting the type of assessment proposed in the original formulation of Objective 3. Most respondents felt that such an analysis would not be particularly useful for the following reasons: a) future resource availability is unknown; b) the level of aggregation would not provide useful information; c) UNICEF’s unique contribution is not strictly related to finances, but also to the advocacy and credibility of the ‘voice’; d) the efforts required to address Objective 3 are unrealistic given the assignment’s resources and timeline. In addition, discussion in the reference group meeting focused on asking whether UNICEF has the systems in place to examine whether resources are adequate for results to be achieved. Therefore, the team proposes to address this revised objective by examining the following two questions:

- 3.1 Are data and systems in place to allow UNICEF to evaluate the linkages between resource allocations and intended results?
- 3.2 Are the data and systems in place to allow UNICEF to assess the adequacy of resources to achieve intended results?

The sources needed to answer these two questions are internal reporting systems and the individuals responsible for conceptualizing, updating and maintaining these systems within UNICEF. The primary method to be used involves diagramming the relevant systems and sub-systems as well as an accompanying description of the systems. The information to assess resources and results will be mapped against commonly used value for money frameworks and strengths and gaps noted.

It is important to acknowledge that these systems are currently in a state of transition. Important elements of the system architecture are based on the previous MTSP and are being migrated to align with the Strategic Plan. The team will focus on the data and systems as they are intended to look to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Where possible, a time horizon will be included for key transitions.

In sum, Objective 3 has been re-framed to focus on the systems needed to assess resources in relation to the results to be achieved. The evaluability assessment will not examine whether human and financial resources are adequate to achieve expected results. The majority of inception phase interviewees felt that this line of questioning was either not useful or unachievable within the time and resources available for the evaluability assessment. The team agrees with this assessment. A second element of the original terms of reference dealt with whether sufficient human and financial resources were allocated to support adequate monitoring, evaluating and reporting on results. The team felt that, as phrased, this element would require a systematic and comprehensive examination beyond the available time and resources. However, the team will examine issues related to the systems and capacities needed to monitor and evaluate the Strategic Plan at both regional and country office levels. This information will be used to inform Objective 2 questions related to the adequacy of systems to measure, monitor and verify results.

The team feels that the revised Objective 3 is not only achievable but will provide important information for any future effort to assess the adequacy of resources in relation to results.

Objective 4: Generate guidance on approaches to the evaluations of the Strategic Plan with a view to enhancing the plan's utility

This objective combines an examination of a set of questions and a constructive assessment by the consultants. The questions to be answered are:

- 4.1 Is there an evaluation, research, learning agenda, strategy or plan in place for each outcome, either individually or grouped? If so, do these fit into any overarching learning strategy for the Strategic Plan?
- 4.2 Is there an evaluation, research, learning agenda, strategy or plan in place for crosscutting themes and normative principles, either individually or grouped? If so, do these fit into any overarching learning strategy for the Strategic Plan?
- 4.3 How might the utility of any planned reviews or evaluations be enhanced?

For the first two questions, we will use the sources listed in the evaluability assessment matrix, including, but not limited to, data from the interviews, the Theory of Change and the Global Evaluation Plan 2014-2017. These sources are expected to contain adequate information to: a) identify the presence of research and evaluation agendas; and b) summarize the main content or themes of those agendas.

The third question will be answered using the learning gained through interviews and consultant assessments about how to enhance the relevance and utility of evaluations and research in support of the Strategic Plan. Insights and recommendations will be provided on design elements related to the rollout of the Strategic Plan for the MTR.

Objective 5. Generate evidence and recommendations to guide any enhancements, which may be required regarding the design of the Strategic Plan and arrangements for its implementation

Objective 5 represents an analysis and interpretation of the evidence on a cumulative basis (i.e. across the previous four objectives). The team proposes to address this objective with a single question as follows:

- 1.1 How can the design of the Strategic Plan be substantially enhanced based on the evidence assembled during the evaluability assessment?

The objective and question stated above reflect a modification from the original terms of reference, in which the objective is stated as: "Evidence and recommendations to guide any enhancements that may be required regarding the design of the Strategic Plan and arrangements for its implementation." The team believes that the recommendations regarding implementation arrangements are beyond the scope of an evaluability assessment and cannot be adequately addressed within the time and resources available. With this modification, the team feels that the objective is achievable.

As mentioned above, the evaluability assessment is guided by an evaluation matrix (see *Annex 4*), which, for each objective, identifies key questions, data sources, methods and

characteristics of the analyses. The matrix serves as the reference document from which all conceptual aspects of the assignment are drawn. It will be used as the team's internal quality control mechanism to ensure the completeness of the assignment.

The text above describes the distinction between the scope of the evaluability assessment and the original terms of reference. Other elements of the scope may not be explicitly apparent from the descriptions of the objectives above. The team proposes that the evaluability assessment encompass the Strategic Plan, results framework and Theory of Change document as an integrated package. The scope of the evaluability assessment will cover most aspects of the Strategic Plan, including the impact, outcomes, outputs and crosscutting issues. Components of the Strategic Plan materials related to results-based management and organizational effectiveness and efficiency are considered out of scope.

V. Conducting the evaluability assessment: Approaches, methods and sources

The overall approach is informed by several important factors, including the need to ensure that the evaluability assessment is relevant and useful for UNICEF; conduct and complete the assignment within the designated timeframe; and to the greatest degree possible, draw on available evidence, standards and best practices for conducting evaluability assessments (e.g. UNDG technical briefs on outcomes, outputs, indicators and assumptions/risks). The team proposes the use of a mix of methods and tools that will enable the application of rigor and standardization while also integrating qualitative information to contextualize and nuance the findings.

This section summarizes in tabular form the methods to be employed in the evaluability assessment. As noted above in the description of tools developed for the evaluability assessment, given the volume of material to be assessed and the time-bound nature of the work, the team opted to rely mainly on checklists, matrices and tables. These will be supplemented by semi-structured interviews and a less structured document review for content analysis of specific themes. Defined evaluability criteria and data collection instruments, in their current state of development, appear in Annex 5.

The purpose of the tools is twofold. First, they will allow the assessment of evaluability and measurability of the Strategic Plan and its various components on a spectrum or scale of evaluability. This is preferable to attempting to make a summative, 'yes/no' judgment about the evaluability of the Strategic Plan. Second, they permit the efficient, systematic and transparent application of defined evaluability criteria to a large amount of material. This allows 'apples to apples' comparisons to be made of categorizations made across outcomes and outputs.

Table 3 summarizes the planned use of tools and methods by objective and the section below describes each of these tools.

Evaluability in principle template

In order to complete the evaluability in principle template, the team will review the relevant sections of the Strategic Plan, Theory of Change and results framework (as well as supplementary and revised indicators) against each of the evaluability criteria. This review will focus on the impact and outcome levels. Based on that review, a short narrative will be drafted based on the stated logic and structured assessment of how well each of the criteria has been

met, pointing to specific content contained in the documents. These narratives will include notation on the strengths and limitations in regards to evaluability in principle, per outcome.

Table 3: Tools and methods by objective

Tool	Objective 1	Objective 2	Objective 3	Objective 4	Objective 5
Evaluability in principle template	•				
Theory of Change and indicator suitability tables	•				
Indicator review matrix		•			
Document review and content analysis	•	•	•	•	
Headquarters, regional office and country office interviews	•	•	•	•	
Source mapping	•	•	•		
Visits to UNICEF regional offices	•	•		•	

Indicator review matrix

Completion of the indicator review matrices will be based on careful review of the results framework, supplementary and revised indicators, and indicator sheets that have been developed for each of the outcome areas. The review will be at all levels of the strategic framework, from output to impact, with coverage of all impact and outcome measures and a strategic selection of 30 output measures.

A sample of output indicators has been selected in order to keep the overall evaluability assessment tractable. In order to arrive at these 30 indicators, all 105 output level indicators were first enumerated by outcome. Next, brief descriptions of each indicator were tabulated, again categorized by outputs and outcomes. In the third step, indicator selection was made in a purposive manner with attention to attaining a mix of measurement levels and challenges within each output. For example, under Output 1 (behaviour change, demand creation), indicators were selected that are measured differently based on their focus, namely the presence of a national-level plan (e.g. countries with a maternal, newborn and child health communication plan) as well as the presence of community-level plans (e.g. countries implementing water safety plans at the community level). Where indicators for an output area were largely homogeneous (i.e. Output 6 on regional and global programmes), a smaller number of indicators was selected. The selected indicators will be subject to a more detailed review in which they are assessed against a number of criteria, as presented in Table 2 of this report.

Several of the evaluability criteria rated in this tool can be objectively gauged: system or source identified; baseline specified; target specified; quality; and pertains to crosscutting priority. The remaining criteria, measurability and proximity, will be categorized based on the consultants' knowledge of proper indicator construction and definition (measurability) and the logic of each indicator's relationship to its respective output, outcome or impact statement (proximity).

Document review and content analysis

Certain questions to be answered by the evaluability assessment call for a less structured approach to document review and content analysis. These include questions about the logic and completeness of the causal chain; opportunities and challenges related to translating the Strategic Plan into country programmes of cooperation; and whether there are data and systems in place to allow UNICEF to link resource allocations to intended results. Where possible, the team will rely on document review and content analysis to supplement the use of more systematic methods. In certain cases, document review and content analysis will be the primary method for assessing evaluability. The findings from document review will be incorporated into the write-up of findings, conclusions and recommendations throughout the evaluability assessment.

Interviews at Headquarters, regional offices and country offices

The team will conduct semi-structured interviews with a range of UNICEF staff members at Headquarters and regional and country offices. At Headquarters, interviews will be sought with individuals and groups from each thematic or outcome area and crosscutting areas. In some cases, these interviews will provide important check-back opportunities for the team to share and vet initial findings. At the regional level, interviews will be sought with a range of regional office staff, including directors, deputy directors, chief(s) of planning and of monitoring and evaluation and their staffs, and regional advisors for specific outcome/thematic areas. At the country level, the team will seek interviews with representatives, deputy representatives and planning and monitoring and evaluation staff.

The team will seek interviews with two country offices per region. Ideally, those countries would represent a range of country settings, country programme sizes and humanitarian interventions. Regional office staff will be queried for their input on which countries to interview based on their position in the country programme cycle (e.g. preparation of a CPD and the conduct of an MTR or strategic moment of reflection).

Interview guides will be developed to explore topics such as the degree of agreement around the underlying logic of the Theory of Change; opportunities and challenges related to translating the Strategic Plan into country programmes of cooperation; and measures, tools and mechanisms for measuring crosscutting priorities. Notes will be taken for all interviews and entered into a computer. The team will perform qualitative data analysis using either QDA Miner Lite or Dedoose software.

Source mapping

The inception phase brought to light several important internal systems used for results reporting. The team proposes to develop source maps for two of those systems to identify the expected directional flow of results data from source to Headquarters. Mapping the sources will enable the systematic identification of strengths and challenges for evaluability. As these systems are in transition from a focus on the MTSP to the Strategic Plan, it will not be possible to examine their operations in practice. Appropriate mapping software (e.g. XMind) will be used to create the source maps.

Visits to UNICEF regional offices

In order to answer questions on the translation of the Strategic Plan into country programmes

of cooperation, the team proposes brief visits to several regional offices. While interviews will be sought with a range of personnel in all regional offices, the visits will allow the team to: a) observe first-hand the procedures and processes involved in the translation of the Strategic Plan into country programmes; and b) engage staff more directly over the course of several days. Given the timeframe for the assignment, two regional offices have been proposed for such a visit.

The regional level was selected because regional offices provide information, guidance, coordination and expertise to UNICEF country offices within their region. In the context of the evaluability assessment, regional offices are important, as the first-line reviewers of draft situation analyses, CPDs, country programme action plans (CPAPs) and midterm reviews of country programmes. These materials should provide a good indication of how the Strategic Plan is being interpreted and implemented during the 2015-2017 period.² Moreover, the regional offices are integral to the implementation of each outcome in the Strategic Plan, as part of the sixth output, as follows: “enhanced enabling environment at global and regional levels to realize child rights.” As a driver of cross-border and multi-country initiatives, the regional offices are important actors in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

The criteria target a specific period in the country programme cycle and heterogeneity in the region. Selection criteria appear in Table 4 and are summarized here:

- An important factor was the number of country offices entering a new programme cycle and preparing a CPD for approval in 2015. Regions with a larger number of country programmes in development may provide the best learning opportunities for the evaluability assessment. As shown in Table 4, this variable ranges from 1 (Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA)) to 11 (Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States Regional Office (CEE/CIS)). A complete list of countries preparing new programmes appears in Annex 6.
- The team was also interested in the size or scale of transition in each region’s portfolio. In Table 4, this variable (column 3) is represented as a percentage of 2014 planning levels of regular resources in those countries developing new programs in relation to the regional total. The rationale is that regions with a large portion of their portfolio in transition will be highly engaged in the CPD guidance review processes across sections in the regional office. Again, considerable variation is observed, with CEE/CIS having the highest per cent in transition (66 per cent) compared to ROSA (1 per cent).
- In regards to heterogeneity, the team examined the mix of countries developing new country programmes by income category. Ideally, a region to be visited would have countries developing programmes from across the spectrum of income categories (at least two categories represented and ideally three). The rationale is that country programmes differ depending on the country context. The challenges related to translating the Strategic Plan into the country programme will likewise differ.
- Finally, the team was interested in including regions responding to humanitarian crises, as humanitarian action is a more fully integrated crosscutting theme in the Strategic Plan and an important issue for evaluability.

² As of September 2014, country offices will utilize new guidance for the development of CPDs, including the relationship to the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and a results and resources framework.

Table 4: Criteria for the selection of UNICEF regional offices

Regional office	No. of country programmes for Executive Board approval in 2015	% of portfolio (\$)	Income classification				Humanitarian action for children (Level 2 and Level 3)
			Low	LMI	UMI	High	
CEE/CIS	11	66%	1	3	7	--	Y
East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO)	5	37%	2	1	2	--	Y
Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO)	5	24%	3	2	--	--	Y
Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office (LACRO)	5	15%	--	1	3	1	N
Middle East and North Africa Regional Office (MENARO)	6	31%	--	2	3	1	Y
ROSA	1	1%	--	--	1	--	N
West and Central Africa Regional Office (WCARO)	4	15%	3	1	--	--	Y

Table notes: 1) information on countries presenting programmes to the Executive Board for approval was acquired from Programming Guidance and Systems, Data Research and Policy, as updated on 17 September 2014; 2) the “% of portfolio” was calculated based on planned regular resources for 2014 for those countries in relation to the region as a whole; 3) data on country mix was acquired from the World Bank Data Bank; 4) humanitarian action for children was extracted from UNICEF’s *2014 Humanitarian Action for Children* reporting; 5) LMI = lower middle income and UMI = upper middle income.

Based on a set of selection criteria, CEE/CIS offers an opportunity to assess evaluability in a region with many country programmes in development and a unique mix of country situations. The team views ESARO as good candidate for the second regional office visit as it meets a number of the criteria.

As mentioned above, the regional office visits are intended to allow the team to engage staff in discussions over the course of several days. In addition, where appropriate, the team may be able to observe first-hand the procedures and processes involved in the translation of the Strategic Plan into country programmes. The information acquired will contribute to answering evaluability assessment questions related to the interpretation of the Strategic Plan and its integration into country and regional priorities, its treatment of cross-cutting themes (i.e. gender equality and humanitarian action); its systems for monitoring and reporting results; and its role in shaping regional agendas.

Interviews conducted in both individual and group settings will be the primary method used. A discussion guide will be developed that is specifically tailored to the evaluability assessment issues to be examined at the regional level. Document review will play a lesser, albeit important, role in regional office visits. A draft protocol for regional office visits appears in Annex 7.

VI. Work plan

The activities outlined below will culminate in February 2015 with the final evaluability assessment report. An outline of that report appears in Annex 8. Table 5 provides a timeline and deliverables.

Table 5: Timeline and deliverables

Phase	Deliverable	Date
Inception	Outline inception report and matrix	22 August 2014
	Draft inception report	3 October 2014
	Revised inception report	4 November 2014
Development and validation	Draft evaluability assessment and PowerPoint	23 December 2014
	Validation meetings	19 January 2015
Finalization	Penultimate draft of assessment report	30 January 2015
	Revised final evaluability assessment report	16 February 2015

The main activities for completing the assignment are depicted in Annex 9, along with a detailed timeline. In terms of delegation, the team will share responsibilities across all four objectives and for each stage, with one team member typically taking the lead for specific tasks. The team has a well-established practice of brainstorming, developing materials and conducting review, discussion and revision, with quick turnaround and regular communication.

In the upcoming development and validation phase, the team has designated lead responsibility areas, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Tasks and delegation during the development and validation phase

Activities	Tasks	Lead
Interviews with stakeholders in two regions	Prepare regional office visit protocol	BAP
	Draft discussion guides	BAP
	Prepare document review template	BAP
	Conduct visits	BAP and PS
	Record and compile data	BAP
Interviews with stakeholders at Headquarters, regional offices (not visited) and country offices	Draft discussion guides	BAP
	Conduct interviews	BAP and PS
	Record and compile data	BAP and PS
Extensive desk-based document analysis	Finalize analysis tools	PS
	Apply tools and record – impact, health, HIV/AIDS, social inclusion	PS
	Apply tools and record – impact, water, sanitation, hygiene, nutrition; education, child protection	BAP
	Data handling and compilation	PS
Prepare draft evaluability assessment	Tabulate data across sources, by objective and question	PS
	Conduct analyses and synthesis of data	BAP and PS

	Review, discuss, revise analyses/synthesis	BAP and PS
	Structure and populate summary and synthesis tables	BAP and PS
	Draft evaluability assessment utilizing outline submitted	BAP and PS
Plan and conduct validation meeting	Discuss agenda and expected outcomes with the Evaluation Office	BAP and PS
	Prepare presentation	BAP
	Conduct validation workshop	BAP and PS
	Record key messages	PS
Revise and finalize based on validation meeting	Make revisions in document as per key messages	BAP and PS

VII. Limitations

It is intended that the evaluability assessment be completed in a timely manner. Indeed, the utility of the evaluability assessment is, in part, dependent on its timely implementation allowing adjustments to be made in the Strategic Plan early in its implementation. Timeliness will also influence the scale of the exercise, which will be focused on the Headquarters level, with coverage of the regional office level via two site visits and interviews.

The evaluability assessment also has clear limitations given the scope and scale of the Strategic Plan and the multiple layers and players within UNICEF that will be putting it into action. For example, in order to meet the study objectives, it will not be necessary – nor would it be feasible – to examine every one of the indicators and supplemental indicators contained in the updated results framework. Likewise, the pace of Strategic Plan implementation may mean that certain systems will be examined as they are intended to operate and not how they are actually operating. Perhaps most notable in this regard is the COAR annex on SMQs. These questions, tied to many of the Strategic Plan’s output indicators, were tested in early 2014 and found to generate data of insufficient consistency. After a lengthy process of developing detailed specifications for the indicators, the SMQs will be rolled out (i.e. sent to country offices for completion) in the final quarter of the 2014 calendar year. Based on this timing, the evaluability assessment can detail the architecture of the system and its intended functioning. However, SMQ data will not be submitted at the time that the evaluability assessment is being finalized and therefore no direct assessment of data quality will be possible.

In comparing the evaluability assessment, as laid out in this inception report, to the scope of the exercise, as described in the original terms of reference, several points emerge. First, there is strong agreement with the majority of the scope of the exercise. Areas of departure have been described in this document but are recapped here for convenience:

1. The review of indicators will include all impact and outcome indicators utilizing a light approach. At the level of outputs, a set of 30 indicators has been selected and will be subject to a more in-depth examination.
2. The evaluability assessment will not examine the adequacy of resources for the achievement of expected results.
3. The evaluability assessment will not systematically examine the sufficiency of resources allocated to support adequate monitoring, evaluating and reporting on results.

4. The evaluability assessment will not assess the way in which equity, innovation, gender and humanitarian action have been integrated into the Strategic Plan, per se. However, the evaluability assessment will examine the intended results, as expressed by outputs, outcomes and impact, and the measures and tools related to equity and crosscutting themes (gender equality and humanitarian action).

VIII. Conclusion

The aim of the inception phase has been to firm up the purpose, scope, scale and design of the evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017. The evaluability assessment has five specific objectives detailed above and elaborated with sub-questions in the evaluability assessment matrix. These objectives align very closely but not entirely with the original terms of reference for the evaluability assessment. The assessment will also address the views of stakeholders at Headquarters and regional levels about issues related to the measurement and evaluation of the Strategic Plan. The inception phase, including this report, has been informed by several sources. These include the literature on evaluability assessment methods and how to assess theories of change; examples of quality evaluability assessments conducted previously; an extensive set of interviews with UNICEF staff; and input from the project's reference group.

Assuming our interview sample was reasonably representative of organizational sentiments, it became apparent during this phase that UNICEF staff is supportive of both the evaluability assessment and an eventual evaluation of the Strategic Plan. In particular, there was interest in the notion of introducing any needed corrections to the logic of the plan, and in assessing the Theory of Change – an innovation at UNICEF. Additionally, the results chain and associated indicators and organizational capacity for measurement were mentioned as key areas of inquiry for the evaluability assessment. In terms of the measurability and evaluability of the content of the Strategic Plan, interviewees expressed a desire to know more about the measurability of equity and the degree to which indicators do or do not identify the most disadvantaged; how well crosscutting issues were addressed in the Strategic Plan's logic and measurement; and how the Strategic Plan will be translated into country programmes of cooperation given the highly decentralized nature of UNICEF.

The overall approach to the evaluability assessment will be informed by several important factors, including the need to ensure that the evaluability assessment is relevant and useful for UNICEF; conduct and complete the assignment within a discrete timeframe; and to the greatest degree possible, draw on available evidence, standards and best practices regarding the conduct of evaluability assessments. A mix of methods and tools will be used to allow rigor and standardization while also integrating qualitative information to contextualize and nuance the findings. Specific tools and methods, including checklists and templates, interviews and site visits have been described in the body of the report.

In sum, the evaluability assessment has been designed around many aspects of a large and multi-faceted strategy, yet tailored to be feasible within a limited timeframe and with limited resources. It is expected that the evaluability assessment, when complete, will provide UNICEF with a strong basis for any required corrections to the logic of the Strategic Plan and its proposed measurement. It will also establish some core themes related to future evaluation of the Strategic Plan.

List of Annexes

- Annex 1 Terms of reference for an evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (original)
- Annex 2 Documents and materials reviewed
- Annex 3 Individuals interviewed
- Annex 4 Evaluability assessment matrix
- Annex 5 Evaluability criteria defined and data collection instruments
- Annex 6 Countries presenting programmes for approval to the Executive Board 2015
- Annex 7 Protocol for regional office visits
- Annex 8 Outline for evaluability assessment final report
- Annex 9 Timeline (November 2014-February 2015)

Inception Report Annex 1

Terms of reference for an evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (original)

Evaluability Assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017

Realizing children's rights through improving accountability for results Final terms of reference

UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential.¹ The [UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017](#) provides the overall framework for the implementation of the organization's mission.² The UNICEF Executive Board approved the Strategic Plan in September 2013, which replaced the MTSP.

In order to determine the extent to which progress towards the objectives set out in the Strategic Plan can be readily and reliably measured, monitored and evaluated, the UNICEF Evaluation Office will conduct an evaluability assessment of the plan in 2014.³ Evaluability assessments measure the extent to which a plan can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion.⁴ Conducting the exercise in the first year of the programme cycle will allow UNICEF to strengthen, where necessary, the systems needed to measure, monitor and evaluate progress for results.

The UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017

The Strategic Plan has seven outcomes, which converge to support the realization of the rights of children, especially the most disadvantaged and excluded, as well as address the needs of their communities and families.⁵ The outcomes are results to which UNICEF contributes in collaboration with national partners, civil society and others. The seven outcomes are:

- 1) Health: Improved and equitable use of high-impact maternal, newborn and child health interventions from pregnancy to adolescence and promotion of healthy behaviours.
- 2) HIV and AIDS: Improved and equitable use of proved HIV prevention and treatment interventions by children, pregnant women and adolescents.
- 3) Water, sanitation and hygiene: Improved and equitable use of safe drinking water, sanitation and healthy environments and improved hygiene practices.

¹ The UNICEF mission statement, available at [https://intranet.unicef.org/docny/branding.nsf/0/62222e40c01ab59585256d4f00553363/\\$FILE/UNICEF's%20Mission%20Statement%20Poster.pdf](https://intranet.unicef.org/docny/branding.nsf/0/62222e40c01ab59585256d4f00553363/$FILE/UNICEF's%20Mission%20Statement%20Poster.pdf). Accessed 12 May 2014.

² UNICEF Intranet accessed May 12, 2014.

³ Plan for global thematic evaluations 2014-2017.

⁴ This is in line with the definition of the evaluability assessment, according to the OECD Development Assistance Committee, and is the most widely used.

⁵ United Nations Children's Fund, 'The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017', UNICEF Executive Board second regular session 2013, Item 4 of the provisional agenda, New York, 11 July 2013, http://www.unicef.org/strategicplan/files/2013-21-UNICEF_Strategic_Plan-ODS-English.pdf, accessed 5 November 2015.

- 4) Nutrition: Improved and equitable use of nutritional support and improved nutrition and care practices.
- 5) Education: Improved learning outcomes and equitable and inclusive education.
- 6) Child protection: Improved and equitable prevention of and response to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect of children.
- 7) Social Inclusion: Improved policy environment and systems for disadvantaged and excluded children, guided by improved knowledge and data.

The Strategic Plan also lists seven implementation strategies. It is the responsibility of country programmes, regional offices and Headquarters divisions to determine an appropriate combination of implementation strategies for each outcome. The implementation strategies are:

- 1) Capacity development
- 2) Evidence generation, evidence-based policy dialogue and advocacy
- 3) Partnerships
- 4) South-south and triangular cooperation
- 5) Identification and promotion of innovation
- 6) Support to integration and cross-sectoral linkages
- 7) Service delivery

The end-of-cycle review emphasized the importance of UNICEF involvement in humanitarian action, which cuts across all outcomes. According to the Strategic Plan, interventions will support the achievement of the CCCs, in line with international standards from Sphere and the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, and guided by humanitarian principles. The Strategic Plan also outlines specific and measurable performance targets for humanitarian action.

According to the Strategic Plan, gender equality and the integration of human rights are also integral normative principles and core elements of the refocus on equity and as such it includes actions and outputs dedicated to gender equality and human rights. Gender and human rights-related indicators at the outcome and output levels are included in each of the seven outcome areas results.

In addition to the country programmes, the global and regional programmes also contribute to the Strategic Plan's seven outcomes through global and regional public goods, such as Millennium Development Goal reporting, strengthened global systems for child rights and enhanced engagement in children's rights by regional institutions.

The preparation of the Strategic Plan was informed by the end-of-cycle review of the MTSP and guided by a peer review group of experts on results-based management drawn from United Nations agencies (UNAIDS, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UN Women, WFP and WHO) and Member States (Australia, Canada, China, Djibouti, Kenya, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan and the United Kingdom).⁶ UNICEF also consulted with additional Member States, other United Nations agencies and representatives of civil society organizations in a workshop held in March 2013. According to a background note to the consultation workshop on the MTSP, several important global processes were taken into consideration in the drafting of the Strategic Plan, including the Secretary-General's Five-Year Action Agenda, a renewed

⁶ The Peer Review Group list is available at: UNICEF, 'Strategic Plan 2014-2017', <<http://www.unicef.org/strategicplan/>>, accessed 12 August 2015.

commitment to child survival, as outlined in *A Promise Renewed*, the ongoing discussions on the development of the post-2015 agenda, and the QCPR, 2012.⁷

Rationale of the exercise

The Strategic Plan is a critically important document that provides the overall framework for UNICEF-supported programmes of cooperation in all countries and for the work plans and office management plans in all regional offices and Headquarters divisions.⁸ It is important to provide assurance to UNICEF management and stakeholders that the Strategic Plan is robust and that it will be possible to measure and assess the results achieved following implementation. An independent assessment of the Strategic Plan's design will help to provide such assurance. This constitutes the overall goal of the evaluability assessment.

Conducting an evaluability exercise during the first year of implementation of the Strategic Plan will support the validation of the performance indicators and targets and check whether the means to measure performance indicators are in place. Clarity in indicators, targets and means to measure them will support implementation of the Strategic Plan and help to improve the quality of future evaluations of implementation and results. The participatory approach taken for the evaluability assessment will also support programme colleagues to improve project and programme design through greater understanding of the results chain.

Purpose and objectives

The purpose of the evaluability assessment is to determine the extent to which progress towards the objectives of the Strategic Plan can be readily and reliably measured, monitored and evaluated. To the extent that such an assessment contributes towards enhancing UNICEF's readiness to reliably measure, monitor, evaluate and report on progress, it also contributes towards UNICEF's organizational and development effectiveness.

More precisely, the exercise will generate:

- 1) An assessment of the clarity, relevance and coherence of the Strategic Plan's design, including the integrity of the causal chain linking inputs and activities with expected outcomes and goals;
- 2) An assessment of the adequacy and validity of the indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results; and of the adequacy and quality of data to be used in monitoring, measuring and evaluating results, including any significant gaps in coverage;
- 3) An assessment of the extent to which human and financial resource allocations are adequate to achieve expected results; and whether sufficient human and financial resources are allocated to support adequate monitoring, evaluating and reporting on results;
- 4) Guidance on approaches to the evaluation of the Strategic Plan with a view to enhancing its utility;

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Available at <<https://icon.unicef.org/apps02/cop/MTSP/SitePages/Home.aspx>>.

- 5) Evidence and recommendations to guide any enhancements, which may be required regarding the design of the Strategic Plan and arrangements for its implementation.

Scope

The evaluability assessment will:

- Determine the clarity of the Strategic Plan's overall design by examining whether the results chain and objectives are clearly articulated and whether relevant, reliable and valid indicators, measures, tools and mechanisms are in place. In practice, this will require a review of the Theory of Change for each of the seven outcomes in the Strategic Plan, including related outputs, implementation strategies and crosscutting issues, to determine whether a clear, comprehensive and coherent results framework is in place.
- Review performance indicators and targets to determine whether they adequately measure progress at different levels of the results chain; and identify any significant gaps in coverage.
- Assess the availability and quality of the data needed to measure and monitor results (including the availability and sufficiency of baselines and targets).
- Assess the adequacy and quality of information available from current monitoring systems to conduct useful evaluations. To that effect, monitoring systems will be mapped and reviewed. UNICEF-supported programmes of cooperation, programme work plans and office management plans in regional offices and Headquarters divisions will be analysed. CPDs, the UNDAF and other sources of reporting will also be examined. The adequacy of resources will be reviewed to determine the financial capacity for monitoring and evaluation. The assessment will identify whether adequate monitoring and evaluation frameworks are in place and whether sufficient budgets are set aside in Vision.
- The evaluability assessment will pay particular attention to assessing the way key cross-sectoral priorities, equity, innovation, gender and humanitarian action, have been integrated into the Strategic Plan. More specifically, the assessment will provide clarity on what results UNICEF sets out to achieve and identify whether the measures, tools and mechanisms are in place to measure crosscutting priorities.
- Develop the evaluation matrix indicating the sources of information to measure the outcomes areas.
- Provide guidance on approaches to the evaluation of the Strategic Plan, including consideration of the benefits and constraints of conducting a final evaluation.

Evaluability assessment questions

- 1) Examine the clarity of the Strategic Plan's logic (Theory of Change), with a view to strengthening it.
 - Is there a continuous causal chain that connects UNICEF with its intended

- results?
 - Have risks and assumptions been adequately identified? Is there an adequate risk management plan?
- 2) Assess the Strategic Plan's context, constraints and connectedness.
 - How realistic are the global results in light of the resources provided for the Strategic Plan?
 - What are the opportunities and constraints for the Strategic Plan to be operationalized into country programmes?
- 3) Examine the Strategic Plan's coverage and coherence.
 - Does the Strategic Plan have gaps that would affect the likelihood of UNICEF achieving the anticipated outcomes?
 - Have equity, humanitarian action, environmental sustainability, innovation and other crosscutting themes been adequately addressed and integrated?
 - Have gender and human rights been adequately addressed and integrated?
- 4) Assess the availability and quality of information.
 - Are data (both baseline and otherwise) adequate to generate credible evidence?
 - Are crosscutting themes adequately measured?

Approach and methods

The UNICEF Evaluation Office will manage the evaluability assessment, which will be conducted in close collaboration with UNICEF staff. This approach has the objective to a) actively promote ownership; b) instil evaluative thinking in planning and programming; and c) provide accountability for results in a relevant final product. The assessment will be conducted in three phases.

1. Inception phase

The inception phase will involve a briefing from the UNICEF Evaluation Office and the reference group and discussions with selected UNICEF staff at New York Headquarters and regional and country offices. This phase will also involve an initial desk review that will analyse the Strategic Plan, documents related to its preparation, the previous UNICEF strategy, as well as CPDs, work plans, management plans, programme strategies and any additional documents shared by UNICEF colleagues.⁹

During this phase the consultants will produce a 20-25 page approach paper that presents the options and elaborations of the evaluability assessment. It will further refine the objectives, scope and key questions to be answered by the evaluability exercise. Finally, it will present the methods that will be used to prepare the final report, as well as a work plan.

⁹ An initial list of documents will be shared with the consultants but will have to be complemented during the interview process.

2. Development phase

The second phase of the evaluability assessment will involve an extensive desk review and analysis. It will also include workshops with UNICEF staff from all outcome areas and supporting departments. It will involve visits to regional and country offices to discuss the Strategic Plan with UNICEF staff, especially with regard to the constraints, opportunities, contextual and substantive issues related to the operationalization of the Strategic Plan at the country level. During this phase, the consultants will produce a draft evaluability assessment report that includes an evaluation matrix, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

3. Validation phase

In the third phase, a stakeholder workshop will be held with UNICEF staff to validate the major findings of the draft evaluability assessment report. The reference group will discuss and comment on the evaluability assessment, checking for factual errors or errors of interpretation.

The peer review group, comprised of external sectoral experts, will also review the draft evaluability assessment report and provide technical feedback. The exercise will culminate with the completion of the evaluability assessment report.

Timeframe and deliverables

The evaluability assessment will be conducted over a four-month period, from July to October 2014. The specific deliverables are as follows.

1. An approach paper, following an initial desk review, which outlines the scope and methods and chapter plan for the final evaluability assessment, including instruments for interviews, an outline of the final evaluability assessment and a work plan.
2. A final evaluation assessment report based on comments received on the draft evaluability assessment during the validation phase. The lead consultant will finalize the evaluability assessment as required, and submit the final report and summary to the UNICEF Evaluation Office.
3. PowerPoint presentation: A summary of key findings and conclusions prepared towards the end of the evaluability assessment and submitted before the stakeholder validation workshop (10-15 slides).

Activity	Deliverable	Deliverable date
Initial desk review and briefing by the Evaluation Office, discussions with UNICEF staff in Headquarters and regional and country offices, preparation of approach paper	Approach paper	20 September 2014
Interviews with stakeholders in five regions, interviews with stakeholders in New York Headquarters, extensive	Draft evaluability assessment	September/October 2014
	PowerPoint presentation	To be submitted prior to the validation workshop

desk-based document analysis, preparation of concept note		
Stakeholder workshop, drafting of final report based on findings of stakeholder workshop and Evaluation Office and reference group feedback	Final evaluability assessment report	10 November 2014

Governance

The Evaluation Office will manage the evaluability assessment independently of stakeholders involved in the preparation of the Strategic Plan (although in consultation with stakeholders). The Evaluation Office will commission a team of two individuals, an evaluation team leader and an evaluation expert to undertake the evaluation. A reference group will be established to provide advice to ensure the relevance and utility of the evaluability assessment. It will be composed of UNICEF staff in Headquarters from the Division of Policy and Strategy, the Programme Division and the Office of Emergency Programmes; associate directors or their representatives for each of the seven sectors; as well as UNICEF staff from country and regional offices.

A peer review group comprised of 5-6 sectoral experts external to UNICEF will also be established to review the draft evaluability assessment report and provide technical feedback.

Team composition and consultant profile

The assessment will be carried out by two consultants (a team leader and an evaluation expert) over the course of four months, between July and October 2014. The duration is expected to be 70 days for the team leader and 65 days for the evaluation expert. The assignment will require travel to New York and regional offices.

Minimum qualifications required

- At least 10 years of experience conducting or managing evaluations. Preference will be given to candidates with experience conducting evaluability assessments or evaluations at the strategic and policy levels
- Experience working with the United Nations, particularly UNICEF. Preference will be given to candidates with a strong understanding of UNICEF policies and programming
- Master's degree or equivalent in Development Studies, Economics, Social Studies, International Relations or other related field
- Proven skills in research analysis, including quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques
- Excellent report writing, analytical and computer skills
- Excellent command of written and spoken English
- Experience leading teams (for the position of Team Leader)

Inception Report Annex 2

Documents and materials reviewed

1. Davies, R. (2013). 'Planning Evaluability Assessments. A synthesis of the literature and recommendations'. DFID Working Paper 40. London: DFID. Available at <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/misc_InfoComm/61141-DFIDWorkingPaper40-finalOct13.pdf>.
2. Davies R. (2012). 'Criteria for assessing the evaluability of a Theory of Change', 5 April. Available at <<http://mandenews.blogspot.co.uk/2012/04/criteria-for-assessing-evaluability-of.html>>.
3. Evaluability assessment template.
4. International Labour Organization (2012). 'Dimensions of the evaluability instrument', 20 March. Available at <http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165985.pdf>.
5. International Labour Organization (2011). 'Using the evaluability assessment tool', 20 December. Available at <http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165984.pdf>.
6. Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (2003). 'Evaluability assessment: examining the readiness of a program for evaluation', May. Available at <<http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf>>.
7. Leviton, L.C., et al. (2010). 'Evaluability Assessment to Improve Public Health Policies, Programs, and Practices. *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, 31: 213–33.
8. Ruben R. (2012). *Evaluability assessment: preparatory steps before starting an evaluation*. The Netherlands: Ministry of Foreign Affairs Policy and Operations Evaluation Department.
9. Taplin, D.H. et al. (2013). 'Theory of Change Technical Papers: A Series of Papers to Support Development of Theories of Change Based on Practice in the Field', April. Available at <http://www.theoryofchange.org/wp-content/uploads/toco_library/pdf/ToC-Tech-Papers.pdf>.
10. Thurston, W.E. and L. Potvin (2003). 'Evaluability assessment: a tool for incorporating evaluation in social change programs', Available at <http://www.stes-apes.med.ulg.ac.be/Documents_electroniques/EVA/EVA-PROG/ELE%20EVA-PROG%207370.pdf>.
11. Trevisan, M.S. and Yi Min Huang (2003). 'Evaluability assessment: a primer'. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 8(20).
12. UNICEF (2014). *Humanitarian Action for Children*. New York: UNICEF.
13. UNICEF (2014). Programme Instruction. CF/PD/PRO/2014-002. Subject line: Revised Format for Country Programme Documents submitted and approved at the second regular session of the Executive Board 2014.
14. UNICEF (2014). 'Revised Supplementary Programme Note on the Theory of Change for the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017', 6 May 2014. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/strategicplan/files/2014-CRP_14-Theory_of_Change-7May14-EN.pdf>.
15. UNICEF (2014). 'Final results framework of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017', 4 April 2014. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/french/about/execboard/files/2014-8-Final_results_framework-UNICEF_Strategic_Plan-22Apr14-EN.pdf>.
16. UNICEF (2013). 'Programme planning levels for regular resources 2014', 14 November 2013. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2014_Board_Paper_Planning_levels_for_RR-14Nov2013.pdf>.
17. United Nations Development Fund for Women (2009). 'Guidance note for carrying out an

- evaluability assessment'. UNIFEM Evaluation Unit.
18. United Nations Development Group (2011). 'Results-based management handbook: Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level', October 2011. Available at <<https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/UNDG-RBM-Handbook-2012.pdf>>.
 19. United Nations Development Group (2011). 'Updated RBM Technical Briefs on Outcomes, Outputs, Indicators, and Assumptions and Risks'. UNDG, February 2011.
 20. Valters, C. (2014). 'Theories of change in international development: Communication, learning or accountability?' August 2014. Available at <<http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/research/JSRP/downloads/JSRP17.Valters.pdf>>.
 21. Vogel, I. (2012). Review of the use of 'Theory of Change' in international development', April 2012. Available at <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/mis_spc/DFID_ToC_Review_VogelV7.pdf>.

Inception Report Annex 3

Individuals interviewed

Individual	Position
Eddie Addai	Regional Chief, PP Monitoring and Evaluation, ESARO
Mathieu Brossard	Senior Advisor Education, Education Section Programme Division
Thilly de Bodt	Senior Adviser, HIV and AIDS, Programme Division
Etona Ekola	Chief, Fields Results Group Section
Dominique Hyde	Deputy Director, Public Partnerships Division
Yasmin Jamshed	Planning Specialist, Policy, Strategy and Network, DRP
Inoussa Kabore	Regional Chief, Monitoring and Evaluation, WCARO
Colin Kirk	Director, Evaluation Office
Catherine Langevin-Falcon,	Chief –Strategic Planning and Communication Support
George Laryea-Adjei	Deputy Director, Division of Data, Research and Policy
Craig Michael McClure	Associate Director, HIV and AIDS
Geeta Narayan	Regional Chief, Programme & Planning, MENARO
Ada Ocampo	Senior Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office,
Laura Olsen	Evaluation Office
Jeff O'Malley	Director, Division of Data, Research and Policy
Isiye Ndombi	Deputy Regional Director, EAPRO
Laurence Reichel	Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office
Arturo Romboli	Programme & Planning Specialist, DOC
Christian Salazar	Deputy Director, Programme Division
Mathew Varghese	Senior Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office
Tessa Wardlaw	Chief, Strategic Information, DRP/Programme Specialist
Alexandra Eva Yuster	Associate Director, Social Inclusion and Policy, PD
Maniza Zaman-Cespedes	Deputy Director, Programme Division

Inception Report Annex 4 Evaluability assessment matrix

Matrix for the evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017

Objectives and questions	Data sources	Data collection methods and tools	To be determined through
Objective 1. Assess the relevance, clarity, and coherence of the Strategic Plan's design, including the integrity of the causal chain linking inputs and activities with expected outputs, outcomes and impact			
1.1 How relevant is the Strategic Plan in relation to UNICEF's charter documents?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 • Theory of Change • Results framework • CRC • CCC • QCPR • UNDG Programming Principles • UNICEF mission statement 	Document review	Mapping of the Strategic Plan outcomes to charter document sections/articles to assess relevance.
1.2 To what extent do the Strategic Plan, Theory of Change and results framework present a clear and comprehensive causal chain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 • Theory of Change • Results framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review • In principle template • Theory of Change and indicator suitability tables 	Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, vetted with outcome owners and stakeholders, and findings synthesized.
1.3 How plausible and testable are the Theory of Change and associated results, indicators and activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 • Theory of Change • Results framework • Indicator sheets for UNICEF Strategic Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review • In principle template • Indicator review matrix • Theory of Change and indicator suitability tables 	Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, vetted with outcome owners and stakeholders, and findings synthesized.

<p>1.4 How well have key assumptions, risks and mitigation strategies been specified?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews at Headquarters • The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 • Theory of Change • Results framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In principle template • Interviews using semi-structured interview guides 	<p>Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, vetted with outcome owners and stakeholders, and findings synthesized.</p>
<p>1.5 What are the issues pertaining to the evaluability, in principle, of cross-cutting priorities and normative principles (i.e. equity, gender equality, humanitarian action, environmental sustainability, innovation and human rights)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews at Headquarters and regional office levels • The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 • Theory of Change • Results framework • Indicator sheets • Gender Action Plan • MoRES Evaluation • Humanitarian Performance Monitoring Toolkit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews using semi-structured interview guides • In principle template • Indicator review matrix • Theory of Change and suitability tables 	<p>Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, vetted with outcome owners and stakeholders, and findings synthesized.</p>
<p>1.6 What are the opportunities and challenges in translating the Strategic Plan into country programmes of cooperation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders at Headquarters and selected regional offices • Draft country programme documents where relevant • Country programme document guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews using semi-structured interview guides • Document review 	<p>a) Qualitative analyses of extensive interview responses across all regions; b) Direct engagement with key regional office staff involved in Strategic Plan translation; c) Content analyses of documents reviewed</p>
<p>Objective 2. Assess the adequacy and validity of the indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results; and of systems and tools to assess the adequacy and quality of data to be used in monitoring, measuring and evaluating results, including any significant gaps in coverage</p>			
<p>2.1 Are indicators in place? Have the indicators been defined (e.g. numerators and denominators) with clearly understood standards?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results framework • RAM • COAR/SMQ • Indicator sheets 	<p>Indicator review matrix</p>	<p>Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, vetted with outcome owners and stakeholders, and findings synthesized.</p>

2.2 Are baselines in place for indicators?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results framework • Indicator sheets 	Indicator review matrix	Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, vetted with outcome owners and stakeholders, and findings synthesized.
2.3 Have specific sources of information been identified for the indicators, and are systems in place to verify those sources?	Indicator sheets	Indicator review matrix	Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, vetted with outcome owners and stakeholders, and findings synthesized.
2.4 Is there a data generating system in place with defined responsibilities, sources and periodicity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results framework • Indicator sheets • COAR/SMQ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator review matrix • Interviews • Source mapping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Analyses of qualitative data; and b) Findings from source mapping
2.5 Are measures, tools, and mechanisms in place to measure crosscutting priorities and normative principles?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theory of Change • Results framework • Indicator sheets • COAR/SMQ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator review matrix • Interviews • Source mapping 	Analysis at outcome level compares each to recommended criteria drawn from literature and UNDG guidance. Criteria descriptions appear in Annex 5. Narrative prepared based on review of documents, combined with findings from source mapping, supplemented by stakeholder interviews, findings synthesized.
Objective 3. Assess data and systems to determine the degree to which human and financial resources can be evaluated against the expected results			
3.1 Are data and systems in place to allow UNICEF to link resource allocations to intended result?	Programme Information Database	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review • Interviews • Source mapping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Analyses of qualitative data; and b) Findings from source mapping
3.2 Are the data and systems in place to allow UNICEF to assess the adequacy of resources to achieve intended results?	Headquarters-level interviews	Interviews	Qualitative analyses of interview responses

Objective 4. Guidance on approaches to the evaluations of the Strategic Plan with a view to enhancing its utility			
4.1 Is there an evaluation, research, learning agenda, strategy or plan in place for each outcome?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews at Headquarters • Theory of Change • Global Evaluation Plan 2014-2017 • Relevant documents to be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview using semi-structured interview guides • Document review 	The qualitative synthesis of data sources listed in column two. Consultants will extract and compile and refer to relevant information on evaluation, learning and research from both interviews and document review.
4.2 Is there an evaluation, research, learning agenda, strategy or plan in place for each crosscutting theme and normative principle? If so, do these fit into any overarching learning strategy for the Strategic Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews at Headquarters • Theory of Change • Global Evaluation Plan 2014-2017 • Relevant documents to be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview using semi-structured interview guides • Document review 	The qualitative synthesis of data sources listed in column two. Consultants will extract and compile and refer to relevant information on evaluation, learning and research from both interviews and document review.
4.3 How might the utility of planned evaluations be enhanced? Would these fit into any overarching learning strategy for the Strategic Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews at Headquarters • Theory of Change • Global Evaluation Plan 2014-2017 • Relevant documents to be determined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview using semi-structured interview guides • Document review 	Recommendations to be based on thematic/content analysis of interview data, assessment by the consultants.
Objective 5. Evidence and recommendations to guide any enhancements which may be required regarding the design of the Strategic Plan			
5.1 How can the design of the Strategic Plan be substantially enhanced based on the evidence assembled during the evaluability assessment?	Will draw from sources identified above	Will draw from tools identified above	Consultant assessment to identify the evidence and recommendations followed by a validation exercise to be conducted with stakeholders, followed by refinements.

Inception Report Annex 5

Evaluability criteria defined and data collection instruments

Evaluability in principle template ¹	
Evaluability criteria	Answers the question
Relevance and clarity	Are the Theory of Change components clearly relevant to the needs of the target group, as identified by any form of situation analysis, baseline study, or other evidence and argument? Is the intended beneficiary group clearly identified? Are the elements of the Theory of Change clearly identified and are the proposed steps towards achieving these clearly defined?
Plausibility and testability	Is there a continuous causal chain, connecting outputs and outcomes to the final impact of concern? Is it possible to identify which linkages in the causal chain will be most critical to the success of the strategy and thus should be the focus of evaluation questions?
Validity	Are there valid indicators for each expected event (output, outcome and impact levels), that is, will they capture what is expected to happen?
Context	Have assumptions about the roles of other actors outside of UNICEF been made explicit (both enablers and constrainers)? Are there plausible plans to monitor these in any practicable way?
Agreement	To what extent are different stakeholders holding different views about the strategy objectives and how they will be achieved? How visible are the views of stakeholders who might be expected to have different views?

TEMPLATE		
Evaluability criteria	Score	Comment
Relevance and clarity		
Plausibility and testability		
Validity		
Context		
Agreement		

Indicator review matrix	
Evaluability criteria	Answers the question
Measurability	How reliably can the indicator be measured given specifications in the results framework and indicator sheets?
Proximity	In logical/conceptual terms, how close is the indicator to the impact, outcome or output statement?
System or source identified	Has a specific source or system been identified to collect the indicator?
Baseline	Has a baseline measure for the indicator been provided, including for any specified necessary stratification?
Target	Has a target value for the indicator been provided, including for any specified necessary stratification?
Specificity	Has the indicator been defined (e.g. numerator and denominator)? Are there standards defined that gauge acceptable quantities and qualities?
Quality	Has the data quality been verified through either internal or external checks?
Pertains to crosscutting priority	Does the indicator pertain to equity ('E'), humanitarian situations ('H') or gender equality ('G')

¹ Based in part on: R. Davis, Planning Evaluability Assessments, DFID working paper 40, Department for International Development UK, 2013, Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/248656/wp40-planning-eval-assessments.pdf>; and United Nations Development Group, Updated RBM Technical Briefs on Outcomes, Outputs, Indicators, and Assumptions and Risks, February 2011.

Indicator Review Matrix

P3. Outcome: Improved and equitable use of safe drinking water, sanitation, and improved hygiene practices	Indicator Defined	Measurability	Baseline Specified	Target Specified	System or Source Identified	Quality	Proximity to Impact	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P3.1 Countries in which more than 75% of households have an improved source of drinking water									
P3.2 Countries in which more than 50% of the population has an improved sanitation facility									
P3.3 Countries in which more than 50% of primary and secondary schools have WASH facilities meeting national standards									
P3.4 Countries in which more than 20% of households have appropriate hand-washing facilities									
P3.5 Countries in which more than 33% of the population practises open defecation									
P3.6 Number and percentage of people in humanitarian situations who access and use (a) safe drinking water, (b) adequate sanitation and hygiene facilities, (c) handwashing facilities§									

Outcome Level Theory of Change and Suitability of Indicators

Outcome	Outcome level Theory of Change	Suitability of outcome level indicators
1. Health	If ... And if Then UNICEF's contribution to the outcome will be ...	

Inception Report Annex 6

Countries presenting programmes for approval to the Executive Board 2015

Region	Country	Cycle	CPD submission	Income level category	2014 RR planning level (x000)
CEE/ CIS	Georgia	2011-2015	September	Lower middle	892
	Turkmenistan	2010-2015	June	Upper middle	919
	Uzbekistan	2010-2015	September*	Lower middle	3,607
	Armenia	2010-2015	June	Lower middle	868
	Serbia and Kosovo	2011-2015	September	Upper middle	854
	Macedonia, FYR	2010-2015	September	Upper middle	854
	Tajikistan	2010-2015	September	Low	2,551
	Kazakhstan	2010-2015	September	Upper middle	897
	Azerbaijan	2011-2015	September	Upper middle	949
	Belarus	2011-2015	September	Upper middle	850
	Turkey	2011-2015	September	Upper middle	875
	Regional				21,447
EAP	Cambodia	2011-2015	September	Low	5,664
	China	2011-2015	September	Upper middle	8,112
	Indonesia	2011-2015	September	Lower middle	5,308
	DPR Korea	2011-2015	September	Low	2,381
	Malaysia	2011-2015	September	Upper middle	854
		Regional			
ESA	Madagascar	2008-2014	February	Low	11,363
	Swaziland	2011-2015	June	Lower middle	982
	Uganda	2010-2015	September	Low	21,388
	Zambia	2011-2015	September	Lower middle	8,572
	Zimbabwe	2012-2015	June	Low	6,093
		Regional			
LAC	Argentina	2010-2015	September	Upper middle	856
	El Salvador	2012-2015	September	Lower middle	913
	Panama	2012-2015	September	Upper middle	854
	Uruguay	2011-2015	September	High (non-OECD)	854
	Colombia	2008-2012		Upper middle	910
		Regional			
MENA	Algeria	2012-2015	June or Sept.	Upper middle	1,129
	Lebanon	2010-2015	June or Sept.	Upper middle	854
	Libya	2013-2015	Extension TBC	Upper middle	850
	Oman	2012-2015	September	High (non-OECD)	
	Syrian Arab Republic	2007-2015	June	Lower middle	1,055
	Yemen	2012-2015	June or Sept.	Lower middle	7,840
		Regional			
ROSA	Maldives	2011-2015		Upper middle	854
		Regional			146,697
WCA	Burkina Faso	2011-2015	September	Low	15,137
	Cote d' Ivoire	2009-2015	September	Lower middle	9,782
	Guinea-Bissau	2008-2015	September	Low	2,449
	Mali	2008-2014	February	Low	15,069
		Regional			

Inception Report Annex 7

Protocol for regional office visits

Objective

The evaluability assessment seeks to answer important questions about the translation of the Strategic Plan into country programmes of cooperation. In order to examine this issue with sufficient depth, the team proposes brief visits to several UNICEF regional offices. While interviews will be sought with key personnel in all seven regional offices, the visits will allow the team to: a) observe first-hand the procedures and processes involved in translating the Strategic Plan into country programmes; and b) engage staff more directly over the course of several days on issues related to evaluability.

Selection criteria

The two regions were selected (ESA and CEE/CIS) based on the number of UNICEF country offices preparing new country programmes of cooperation for approval in 2015; the size or magnitude of those country programmes in relation to the country programmes in development based on income level; and the presence of humanitarian action within the region.

Timing and duration of visit	Three to four days during the period 20-31 October
Proposed activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide orientation to regional office on the evaluability assessment • Interview a range of regional office staff • Review materials available in the regional office on CPDs in development, including guidance materials, reviews, feedback, etc. • Review of materials available that reflect the regional office's approach to Strategic Plan implementation (e.g. evaluation plans, regional office management plans) • As appropriate, observe any processes involving the translation of the Strategic Plan into country programmes (e.g. review processes, results reporting systems)
Individuals to be interviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional director • Regional deputy director • Regional chief of planning and staff • Regional director of monitoring and evaluation and staff • Regional advisers in select thematic areas (gender, humanitarian response, health, HIV/AIDS, water and sanitation, nutrition, education, child protection, social inclusion)
Products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A brief synthesis of information extracted from both interviews and document review and categorized by evaluability assessment objective and question • The team aims to provide a synthesis that is directly relevant to the key question of the evaluability assessment and is of interest to the regional office

Inception Report Annex 8

Outline for evaluability assessment final report

Evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017

Outline of final report

- 1) Executive summary
- 2) Introduction and background
 - a. Summary of the Strategic Plan, Theory of Change and results framework
 - b. Purpose and approach of the evaluability assessment
 - c. Themes and questions of the evaluability assessment
- 3) Methodology
 - a. Data collection and sources
 - b. Data analysis
 - c. Limitations of the evaluability assessment
- 4) Findings on the evaluability of the Strategic Plan
 - a. Relevance, clarity and coherence of the Strategic Plan
 - b. Adequacy and validity of the indicators, tools and systems
 - c. Systems to link resources against expected results
- 5) Conclusions and recommendations
 - a. Conclusions
 - b. Summary
 - c. Recommendations: Approaches to evaluations of the Strategic Plan

Inception Report Annex 9 Timeline (November 2014-February 2015)

Week No. Date	2014								2015							
	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	3-Nov	10-Nov	17-Nov	24-Nov	1-Dec	8-Dec	15-Dec	22-Dec	29-Dec	5-Jan	12-Jan	19-Jan	26-Jan	2-Feb	9-Feb	16-Feb
Inception Phase																
Briefing by E.O																
Initial desk review																
D: Outline inception report & matrix																
Discussions with UNICEF staff																
D: Validation meetings (26 Sept.)																
Preparation of inception report																
D: Inception report																
Revision of inception report																
D: Revised inception report	•															
Development and Validation Phase																
Interviews with stakeholders in two regions		•	•													
Interviews with OS not visited	•	•														
Interviews with outcome stakeholders in NYHQ					•											
Extensive desk-based document analysis	•															
Country office interviews (~2 per region)			•	•	•											
Preparation of draft valiability assessment						•	•	•								
D: Draft valiability assessment & powerpoint								§								
Validation meeting planning									•							
D: Validation meetings												§				
Revision based on validation mtg												•	•			
D: Penultimate draft valiability assessment													§			
Finalization																
Review of penultimate draft by E.O and RG													•	•		
Revise final report based on E.O and RG feedback															•	•
D: Final valiability assessment report																§

Inception Report Annex 10

Longer responses to issues raised by reviewers

Response 1: Inclusion of country offices

A number of reviewers expressed the view that the evaluability assessment needs to include country offices. Documentation pertaining to country offices has already been included in the inception report (e.g. COAR, CPD, CPAP and integrated results frameworks). Further, the team is in agreement with the comments from the regional offices and would like to propose that a small number of country offices be included as a respondent category for interviews.

The selection process would be carried out in consultation with the regional offices as follows. The consultant team is currently reaching out to regional offices to schedule interviews or plan visits. As part of that discussion, regional office staff would be asked for their input on which country offices should be contacted for interviews. Regional offices will then be asked to reach out to the selected country offices to introduce the exercise. Where the regional office is being visited, a phone/Skype interview with the selected country offices can be carried out during the visit.

The team considers country offices that are preparing a CPD for 2015 submission to the Executive Board as good candidates for inclusion in the evaluability assessment.

However, we note the reviewer comment that “All country programmes are adjusting to the Strategic Plan in different ways, not only those that are being newly designed”. Therefore, we are open to suggestions of country offices that are not already identified in Annex 6 of the inception report. We would like to limit the country office interviews to two per region. Ideally, those countries would represent a combination of factors, including country setting (e.g. socioeconomic standing), size of the country programme of cooperation, and humanitarian action for children underway in the country. The activity timeline has been revised to accommodate these proposed additional interviews.

Response 2: Selection of a subset of output-level indicators for review

A number of reviewers questioned the selection of output indicators for detailed review. Most of these reviewers expressed a preference to have the entire set of output indicators included in the detailed review. More information was requested on the methods used to select the indicators and an annex with the indicator list. The decision to select a subset arose from the need to balance the team’s efforts across five objectives, given time and resources.

The text below provides more description of how all indicators will be assessed as a part of the Theory of Change review and a subset will be examined in greater depth. For the subset (30 indicators), the section below outlines the steps followed to select those indicators. The selected indicators are now annexed to the inception report.

As part of Objective 1, the logic chain which links outputs, outcomes and impact will be examined, inclusive of all relevant indicators at each level. In this exercise, groups of indicators (e.g. a group of indicators would be those intended to capture progress under Output 3, enabling environment, for the education outcome) will be compared to the logic of the results statement to assess their suitability, in aggregate, to reflect progress in the result to be achieved.

As part of Objective 2, a selection of output level indicators was made. As a first step in the selection process, all 105 output level indicators were enumerated by outcome. In the second step, brief descriptions of each indicator were tabulated, again categorized by outputs and outcomes. In the third step, indicator selection was made in a purposive manner with attention to attaining of mix of measurement levels and challenges within each output. For example, under Output 1 (behaviour change, demand creation), indicators were selected that are measured differently based on their focus, namely the presence of a national-level plan (i.e. countries with a maternal, newborn and child health communication plan), as well as the presence of community-level plans (countries implementing water safety plans at the community level). Where indicators for an output area were largely homogeneous (i.e. Output 6 on regional and global programmes), a smaller number of indicators was selected. The selected indicators will be subject to a more detailed review in which they are assessed against a number of criteria as presented in Table 2 of the inception report. A summary table of those selected indicators appears below.

Table 1: Selected indicators by output and outcome area

	Health	HIV/AIDS	WASH	Nutrition	Education	Child protection	Social inclusion
Output 1 (n=12)	X		X	X	X		X
Output 2 (n=18)	X	X	X		X	X	
Output 3 (n=24)	XX	X		X	X		X
Output 4 (n=21)		X		X	X	X	
Output 5 (n=16)		X	X	X	X	XX	
Output 6 (n=14)			XX				XX

Annex 2

Document review/extraction templates for evaluability in principle with examples from the analyses

Criteria	Answers the question...	Illustrative material from the analyses
Relevance and clarity	<p>Are the Theory of Change components clearly relevant to the needs of the target group, as identified by any form of situation analysis, baseline study or other evidence and argument? Is the intended beneficiary group clearly identified? Are the elements of the Theory of Change clearly identified and are the proposed steps towards achieving these clearly defined?</p>	<p>Example 1: The statement of outcome is clear and related to the CRC and the CCCs (nutrition strategic result). The programme is clearly consistent with the Report of the Open Working Group on the Sustainable Development Goals (Goal 2). The description of outcome and programmes areas provides a good synopsis of new knowledge on the long-term consequences of poor nutrition in the first 1,000 days and cost-benefit analyses guiding programming at scale. The outcomes and programme focus areas are also consistent with the end-of-cycle MTSP review, which found that 50 per cent of nutrition programme funds are devoted to emergencies, leaving little available for infant and young child feeding programmes.</p> <p>Example 2: The programme is clearly consistent with the Report of the Open Working Group on the Sustainable Development Goals. The rationale statement is aligned with findings of the end-of-cycle review of the MTSP. The rationale for the programme areas is linked to lagging progress towards the Millennium Development Goal target and inequitable access. An organizational focus on hygiene/hand-washing is based on considerable evidence of its effectiveness in preventable childhood illnesses. Three of the five programme areas are presented as mutually complementary (water supply, sanitation and hygiene) and along with the other two (schools and emergencies) are presented convincingly as a package.</p> <p>Example 3: The description of the outcome area provides clear direction in terms of an increased emphasis on child protection systems and the interplay between child protection systems and social norms; inter-sectoral linkages and utilization of allied systems (e.g. health, education). These child protection systems are not defined in the Strategic Plan, although one could infer that they are related to the mechanisms through duty-bearers to protect the rights of children and action to better equip rights holders (families and communities).</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Plausibility and testability</p>	<p>Is there a continuous causal chain connecting outputs and outcomes to the final impact of concern? Is it possible to identify which linkages in the causal chain will be most critical to the success of the strategy, and thus should be the focus of evaluation questions?</p>	<p>Example 1: Some important shifts in programming are introduced but the underlying rationale is not clearly elaborated. This poses a challenge for evaluability as the rationale for these shifts are unstated, thereby limiting testability.</p> <p>Example 2: Under the third output, one approach is prominent in the discussion of ensuring adequate resources. However, it isn't clear that there is an evidence base that supports the approach by demonstrating its link to increased or better allocated resources. Otherwise, this section provides a clearer understanding of the implementation strategies to be utilized and the rationale behind it.</p> <p>Example 3: Output 5 stands out as providing a clear yet succinct rationale and description of 'concrete steps', albeit very brief.</p> <p>Example 4: The lack of specification about the priority activities (particularly under outputs 1 and 2) and limited description of the evidence-base will make evaluability difficult. It is not possible to determine the weight given to any activity over another. It will be difficult to assess whether the underlying activities add up to the output statement (weak 'if-then' statements).</p> <p>Example 5: Output 2 provides a much clearer description of the ways in which the implementation strategies contribute to the output. While there is no causal chain described, it is clear what types of actions UNICEF will take in order to achieve the output. Evaluation questions could be framed to plausibly link or test the association between these activities and the output.</p> <p>Example 6: Output 3 provides good descriptions of the types of activities to be pursued. Evaluation questions could be framed to plausibly link or test the association between these activities and the output.</p> <p>Example 7: Output 1 does not mention the main implementation strategies. Key areas of work are mentioned with little further elaboration and the narrative doesn't provide insight into what has been found to work. Based on the Theory of Change, it would be very difficult to determine whether and how these activities lead to the stated output-level result.</p> <p>Example 8: Output 6 appropriately identifies the research priorities based on the limited evidence currently available.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Context</p>	<p>Have assumptions about the roles of other actors outside of UNICEF been made explicit (both enablers and constrainers)? Are there plausible plans to monitor these in any practicable way?</p>	<p>Example 1: Per the definitions provided, the activity-to-output assumptions should deal with both lower level phenomena related to the internal workings of UNICEF as well as external conditions. For the WASH outcome, however, all other activity-to-output assumptions are external in nature. There are no WASH-specific assumptions related to the internal workings of the agency. With a few exceptions, the activity-to-output assumptions provided deal with external conditions that are repeated across outcomes with little specific referencing to the specific dynamics within any given sector.</p> <p>Example 2: References are made to partnerships and networks although no further description is provided regarding their specific roles or assumptions regarding their roles.</p>

Annex 3

Documents reviewed

1. Davies, R. (2013). 'Planning Evaluability Assessments. A synthesis of the literature and recommendations'. DFID Working Paper 40. London: DFID. Available at <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/misc_InfoComm/61141-DFIDWorkingPaper40-finalOct13.pdf>.
2. Davies R. (2012). 'Criteria for assessing the evaluability of a Theory of Change', 5 April. Available at <<http://mandenews.blogspot.co.uk/2012/04/criteria-for-assessing-evaluability-of.html>>.
3. International Labour Organization (2012). 'Dimensions of the evaluability instrument', 20 March. Available at <http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165985.pdf>.
4. International Labour Organization (2011). 'Using the evaluability assessment tool', 20 December. Available at <http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_165984.pdf>.
5. Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (2003). 'Evaluability assessment: examining the readiness of a program for evaluation', May. Available at <<http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluability-assessment.pdf>>.
6. Leviton, L.C., et al. (2010). 'Evaluability Assessment to Improve Public Health Policies, Programs, and Practices'. *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, 31: 213–33.
7. O'Malley, Jeffrey (2014). Looking forward: Post 2015, UNICEF 3.0/4.0 and the Strategic Plan.
8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2002). *Glossary of key terms of evaluation and results based management*. Paris: OECD.
9. Ruben R. (2012). *Evaluability assessment: preparatory steps before starting an evaluation*. The Netherlands: Ministry of Foreign Affairs Policy and Operations Evaluation Department.
10. Taplin, D.H. et al. (2013). 'Theory of Change Technical Papers: A Series of Papers to Support Development of Theories of Change Based on Practice in the Field', April. Available at <http://www.theoryofchange.org/wp-content/uploads/toco_library/pdf/ToC-Tech-Papers.pdf>.
11. Thurston, W.E. and L. Potvin (2003). 'Evaluability assessment: a tool for incorporating evaluation in social change programs', Available at <http://www.stes-apes.med.ulg.ac.be/Documents_electroniques/EVA/EVA-PROG/ELE%20EVA-PROG%207370.pdf>.
12. Trevisan, M.S. and Yi Min Huang (2003). 'Evaluability assessment: a primer'. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 8(20).
13. UNICEF (2015). *A Framework for Research 2014-17*. Florence: UNICEF Office of Research.
14. UNICEF (2014). Attributes to Outputs at the time of results based planning in VISION. Annex to CF/PD/PRO/2014-001 (revised as of 1 December 2014).
15. UNICEF (2014). 'Final results framework of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017', 4 April 2014. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/french/about/execboard/files/2014-8-Final_results_framework-UNICEF_Strategic_Plan-22Apr14-EN.pdf>.
16. UNICEF (2014). *Humanitarian Action for Children*. New York: UNICEF.
17. UNICEF (2014). Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office Regional Office Management Plan 2014-2017 (revised version as of 23 September, 2014).
18. UNICEF (2014). Plan for global thematic evaluations. UNICEF Executive Board first annual session 2014. Item 8 (b) of the provisional agenda, 13 November 2014. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/2014-3_Global_evaluation_plan_2014-2017_DL-

- HR.pdf>.
19. UNICEF (2012). Programme Instruction: Guidelines for the Preparation of the 2014-2017 Office Management Plans. CF/PD/PRO/2012-003, 18 December 2012.
 20. UNICEF (2014). Programme Instruction: New Programme Information Database (PIDB) Coding System in VISION for the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan. CF/PD/PRO/2014-001, 6 January 2014.
 21. UNICEF (2014). Programme Instruction: Revised format for country programme documents submitted and approved at the second regular session of the Executive Board 2014. CF/PD/PRO/2014-002, (addendum to CF/PD/PRO/2013-005), 17 March 2014.
 22. UNICEF (2013). Programme Instruction: Updated guidelines on the development of country programmes to be approved by the 2014 Executive Board. Attachment II: Guidance on the Country Programme Action Plan/UNDAF Action Plan. CF/PD/PRO/2013-005, 8 November 2013.
 23. UNICEF (2013). 'Programme planning levels for regular resources 2014', 14 November 2013. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2014_Board_Paper_Planning_levels_for_RR-14Nov2013.pdf>.
 24. UNICEF. *Programme, Policy and Procedure Manual* (updated February 2015).
 25. UNICEF (2012). *Report on the end-of-cycle review of the medium-term strategic plan 2006-2013*. UNICEF Executive Board first regular session 2013. Item 5 of the provisional agenda. New York: UNICEF. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2013-4-End-of-cycle_review-MTSP-ODS-English.pdf>.
 26. UNICEF (2014). 'Results planning for 2014 and the new coding structure'. PowerPoint presentation.
 27. UNICEF (2014). 'Revised Supplementary Programme Note on the Theory of Change for the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017', 6 May 2014. Available at <http://www.unicef.org/strategicplan/files/2014-CRP_14-Theory_of_Change-7May14-EN.pdf>.
 28. UNICEF. 'The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017: Operationalizing the new Strategic Plan'. PowerPoint presentation.
 29. UNICEF. 'The UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017: Realizing the rights of every child, especially the most disadvantaged'. PowerPoint presentation.
 30. UNICEF Data and Analytics Section (2014). CRING 2014 Guidance Note. CF/EXD/2014-001, 7 March 2014.
 31. United Nations (2014). *Report of the Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals*. A/68/970. New York: United Nations, 12 August 2014. Available at <<http://undocs.org/A/68/970>>.
 32. United Nations (2012). *Strategic Planning in the United Nations System*. Geneva: United Nations Joint Inspection Unit.
 33. United Nations Development Fund for Women (2009). 'Guidance note for carrying out an evaluability assessment'. UNIFEM Evaluation Unit.
 34. United Nations Development Group (2011). 'Results-based management handbook: Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level', October 2011. Available at <<https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/UNDG-RBM-Handbook-2012.pdf>>.
 35. United Nations Development Group (2011). 'Updated RBM Technical Briefs on Outcomes, Outputs, Indicators, and Assumptions and Risks'. UNDG, February 2011.
 36. United Nations Evaluation Group (2013). 'UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System'.
 37. Valters, C. (2014). 'Theories of change in international development: Communication, learning or accountability?' August 2014. Available at

<<http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/research/JSRP/downloads/JSRP17.Valters.pdf>>.

38. Vogel, I. (2012). 'Review of the use of 'Theory of Change' in international development', April 2012. Available at
<http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/mis_spc/DFID_ToC_Review_VogelV7.pdf>.

Documents acquired in CEE/CIS Regional Office

1. UNICEF (2014). Bosnia and Herzegovina Country Programme Document 2015-2019.
2. UNICEF (2014). CEE/CIS Regional Knowledge and Leadership Agenda. CEE/CIS Multi-country evaluation of Results Area 4: Including all children in quality education.
3. UNICEF. CEE/CIS Regional Office Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, 2013-2014.
4. UNICEF (2013). CEE/CIS Regional Office Management Plan 2014-2017. ROMP Annex Results Matrix 2014-2017 (updated to reflect decisions of the 2013 global programme and budget review).
5. UNICEF (2012). Knowledge and leadership agenda 8: Children's right to social protection. Concept Note, December 2012.
6. UNICEF (2012). Knowledge and leadership agenda 8: Children's right to social protection. Terms of reference for reference group, December 2012.
7. UNICEF. Medium-term strategic Plan: Regional knowledge and leadership agenda outcomes mapped.
8. UNICEF (2013). Mid-term review Serbia 2013.
9. UNICEF. Optimising UNICEF core roles and achieving results for children: The evolving UNICEF engagement in CEE/CIS.
10. UNICEF. Realizing the right to social protection for all children in CEE/CIS: Regional Theory of Change.
11. UNICEF (2014). 'Regional Analysis Report 2013'. Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent State (CEE/CIS). Geneva, February 2014.
12. UNICEF (2012). Regional knowledge and leadership agenda concept note, September 2012.
13. UNICEF (2013). Regional knowledge and leadership agenda generic Theory of Change underlying UNICEF's approach in the CEE/CIS region, January 2013.
14. UNICEF (2012). Regional knowledge and leadership agenda update. Monitoring and evaluation network meeting, October 2012.
15. UNICEF (2013). Regional matrix of social protection bottlenecks and corresponding indicators, October 2013.
16. UNICEF. Serbia Country Office Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Plan 2013.2014.

Documents acquired in East and Southern Africa Regional office

1. UNICEF. Africa Engagement strategy.
2. UNICEF. April RMT report.
3. UNICEF (2014). Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office Management Plan 2014–2017 (updated 4 September 2014).
4. UNICEF. ESAR innovation strategy.
5. UNICEF (2014). ESARO Regional Priorities 2014-2017, 6 September 2014.
6. A Post 2015 World Fit for Children slides for Regional Management Team ESARO.
7. UNICEF (2014). *Generation 2030 Africa*. New York: UNICEF Division of Data, Research and Policy, August 2014.
8. UNICEF. GoK-UNICEF Country Programme 2014-18: Strategies to Realise Programme Results.

9. UNICEF (2014). Kenya Draft Country Programme Document. E/ICEF/2014/P/L.9, 24 March 2014.
10. UNICEF. Managing for Results: Eastern and Southern Africa.
11. UNICEF (2013). Programme Performance: ESAR Dashboard, October 2013.
12. UN Malawi (2014). Real Time Monitoring Framework, 30 October 2014.
13. UNICEF. Regional Advocacy Strategy for Eastern and Southern Africa 2014–2017.
14. UNICEF. RMT management indicators.
15. UNICEF (2014). Toward a Resource Mobilization and Leveraging Strategy for UNICEF in Eastern and Southern Africa (draft), October 2014.

Documents acquired from Regional Office for South Asia

1. MacKenzie, Alex, MDC. 27 January 2014
2. ROSA Management Response. 24 June 2014.
3. UNICEF. A regional strategic framework for programming with and for adolescents in South Asia- 2014-2017 (draft).
4. UNICEF (2014). Afghanistan Country Programme Document 2015-2019. E/ICEF/2014/P/L.9.
5. UNICEF (2014) Mid-term review of Government of Bangladesh-UNICEF Country Programme 2012-2016. Ruposhi Bangla Hotel, 29 June 2014.
6. UNICEF. Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA) Evaluability Assessment: Office Management Plan 2014-2017.
7. UNICEF (2013). Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA) Office Management Plan and Integrated Budget 2014-2017, 6 September 2013.
6. UNICEF. Regional Strategy for reducing the number of open defecators in South Asia by 120 million 2014-2017.

Annex 4

Individuals interviewed

Individual	Position	Phase	
		Inc.	Dvl.
Eddie Addai	Regional Chief, PP Monitoring and Evaluation, ESARO	X	X
Mathieu Brossard	Senior Advisor Education, Education Section Programme Division	X	X
Thilly de Bodt	Senior Adviser, HIV and AIDS, Programme Division	X	
Etona Ekola	Chief, Fields Results Group Section	X	
Dominique Hyde	Deputy Director, Public Partnerships Division	X	X
Yasmin Jamshed	Planning Specialist, Policy, Strategy and Network, DRP	X	X
Inoussa Kabore	Regional Chief, Monitoring and Evaluation, WCARO	X	X
Colin Kirk	Director, Evaluation Office	X	X
Catherine Langevin-Falcon	Chief –Strategic Planning and Communication Support	X	
George Laryea-Adjei	Deputy Director, Division of Data, Research and Policy	X	X
Craig Michael McClure	Associate Director, HIV and AIDS	X	
Geeta Narayan	Regional Chief, Programme & Planning, MENARO	X	X
Ada Ocampo	Senior Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office,	X	X
Laura Olsen	Consultant, Evaluation Office	X	
Jeff O'Malley	Director, Division of Data, Research and Policy	X	X
Isiye Ndombi	Deputy Regional Director, EAPRO	X	X
Laurence Reichel	Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office	X	
Arturo Romboli	Programme & Planning Specialist, DOC	X	
Christian Salazar	Deputy Director, Programme Division	X	X
Mathew Varghese	Senior Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office	X	
Tessa Wardlaw	Chief, Strategic Information, DRP/Programme Specialist	X	X
Alexandra Eva Yuster	Associate Director, Social Inclusion and Policy, PD	X	X
Maniza Zaman-Cespedes	Deputy Director, Programme Division	X	X
Marie Pierre Poirier	Regional Director, CEE/CIS Regional Office		X
Lori Bell	Regional Advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation CEECIS		X
Fabio Sabatini	Regional Chief, Programme & Planning ,CEECIS		X
Fiachra McAsey	Deputy Representative, Astana Kazakhstan		X
Jean-Claude Legrand	Regional Advisor, Child Protection, CEECIS		X
Anne Grandjean	Child Protection Specialist, CEECIS		X
Lesley Miller	Regional Partnership Advisor CEECIS		X

Anna Riatti	Deputy Rep. Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) Country Office		X
Paolo Marchi	Child Protection Specialist, BiH Country Office		X
Sabina Zunic	Planning Specialist & M&E CEECIS		X
Siraj Mahmudlu	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist Reg Programme & Planning CEECIS		X
Philippe Testot-Ferry	Regional Advisor, Education, CEECIS		X
Leila Pakkala	Regional Director, ESARO		X
Mark Hereward	Deputy Regional Director, ESARO		X
Camille Baudot	Regional Advisor Education, ESARO		X
Anurita Bains	Regional Advisor, HIV and AIIIDS, ESARO	X	
Lu Wei Pearson	Regional Advisor, Child Survival and Development, ESARO	X	
Natalia Elena Winder-Rossi	Senior Programme Specialist, ESARO	X	
Ann Thomas	WASH Specialist, WASH (sanitation and hygiene)	X	
Won Ki Hong	Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	X	
Paul Mpuga	PME Specialist, Kenya Country Office	X	
Monica Chizororo	Research and Evaluation Specialist, Kenya Country Office	X	
Asseneth Cheboi	Education Specialist, Kenya Country Office	X	
Urs Nagel	Regional Evaluation Advisor, ROSA	X	
Steven Adkinson	Associate Director, Field Research Group Section	X	
Karin Hulshof	Regional Director, ROSA	X	
Alexandra Illmer	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist Bangladesh Country Office, ROSA	X	
Bastiaan Van Hoff	Regional Chief of Planning, LACRO	X	
Herve Peries	Regional Chief, Program and Planning, WCARO	X	
Roumiana Gantcheva	Regional Chief, Monitoring and Evaluation, MENARO	X	
Jeremy Hopkins	Deputy Representative, Somalia Country Office	X	
Mariko Kagoshima	Deputy Representative, Guatemala Country Office	X	
Roisin DeBurca	Deputy Representative, Malawi Country Office	X	
Jane Muita	Deputy Representative, Zimbabwe Country Office	X	
Dan Toole	Regional Director, EAPRO	X	
Werner Schultink	Associate Director, Programme Division, Nutrition	X	
Yarlina Balarajan	Nutrition Specialist, Programme Division, Nutrition	X	
Daniel Kelly	Consultant Education, Programme Division	x	
Susan Bissell	Associate Director, Child Protection, Programme Division	X	
Karin Heissler	Child Protection Specialist Programme Division,	X	
Kendra Gregson	Regional Adviser Child Protection, Kathmandu Nepal	X	
Andrew Trevett	Chief, WASH, Nairobi	X	

Mickey Chopra	Principle Adviser, Health, Programme Division	X	
Theresa Diaz	Senior Advisor Health ,Programme Division,	X	
Debra Jackson	Senior Health Specialist, Health Programme Division,	X	
Sam Bickel	Senior Advisor Evaluation & Research ,Evaluation Office	X	
Anthony Spalton	Emergency Specialist, Programme Division	X	
Boniface Kalanda	Senior Programme Specialist, Field Results Group Section	X	
Yasmin Haque	Deputy Director, Office of Emergency Programmes	X	
Ted Chaiban	Director, Programme Division	X	
Martin Porter	Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, Manila	X	

Annex 5

Strategic Plan characteristics¹

In order to better understand where the UNICEF Strategic Plan sits on a hypothetical continuum (i.e. strategic plan versus framework), the team drew from a review of 36 strategic plans from 26 United Nations agencies conducted by the Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations.² From these strategic plans, the United Nations inspector identified some common characteristics. A set of 10 characteristics appear in Table 1, along with the team's assessment of the extent to which the UNICEF Strategic Plan reflects that characteristic. In 3 of the 10 areas, the UNICEF Strategic Plan reflected the characteristic in a strong manner. In 5 of the 10 areas, the Strategic Plan met the common characteristics to a moderate, albeit still substantial, extent. In one area (resource allocation and mobilization), the team indicated both moderate (allocation) and strong (mobilization) and in another area, the team was not able to determine a rating. This comparison, while limited, suggests that the UNICEF Strategic Plan presents the needed characteristics of a strategic plan with some variability.

Table 1: Characteristics of a Strategic Plan

Characteristics	UNICEF Strategic Plan	Team's observations
Translates an organization's mandate into strategies and actions for implementation	Moderate	Implementation strategies are identified for each output but activities are described unevenly.
May be used to determine resource allocation from the regular budget or as fundraising document to mobilize pledges from donors	Moderate	The Strategic Plan does not serve to determine resource allocations (moderate)
	Strong	The document serves as a basis for fundraising (strong)
Sets the baseline against which managers can measure actual outcomes, compare to expected accomplishments, and report to governing bodies	Moderate	Baselines are established but the variable quality of indicators may limit usability.
Plays a pivotal role between an organization's corporate governance and its management	Strong	Fully met
Communicates goals to staff and results to Member States, through related monitoring and reporting tools	Strong	The Strategic Plan is used for the purpose of communicating goals and objectives; less so for monitoring and reporting as Country Programme monitoring is more relevant for that purpose.
Through regular updates, enables the organization to identify new trends and areas of potential development, as well as those areas that are not needed anymore (obsolete)	Moderate	Global situation assessment provided this input; how that input was used to make strategic choices is not documented; the upcoming MTR provides added opportunity.
Helps to identify overlaps and synergies in delivering outcomes, therefore paving the way for redeployment and/or better	Moderate	The document acknowledges synergies through inter-sectoral language but provides no direction on how to achieve

¹ United Nations, *Strategic Planning in the United Nations System*, United Nations Joint Inspection Unit, Geneva, 2012.

² Ibid.

allocation of resources where they are going to be most effective and efficient for the results of the organization		these; not apparent whether or how this knowledge affects resource allocation.
Strongly related to mandates of the United Nations that shape long-term goals at the global level and provide a reference for these mandates when measuring results and performance.	Strong	Fully met
Should contain an extensive advocacy and information strategy as part of strategic planning, as a means of strengthening the organization's corporate outreach capacity.	?	Division of Communication responsibility? Website not yet updated.
Serves as a managerial tool for organization and planning as well as a means of building internal capacity to translate organizational goals into concrete work.	Moderate	Serves more as a tool to communicate priorities than to manage; aspects of the process contributed to capacity building; further opportunities exist at regional and country levels to build capacity on the theories of change.

Annex 6

Questions on Theory of Change evidence base

In a few instances, the team felt that evidence for the effectiveness of an activity was lacking. In some of the cases, an activity is flagged not only because it figures prominently in the Theory of Change but also because it is used as a performance indicator. The team also noted positively that several outcome areas (i.e. WASH and child protection) acknowledged gaps in the evidence base and identified research priorities as part of Outcome Area 6 (global and regional programme). Very briefly stated, gaps in the evidence base, included:

- Output 1/Health: Support for capacity to produce maternal, newborn and child health communications plans is seen as key, but it is not clear how these communications plans link to the enhanced support for improved healthy behaviours (also a performance indicator).
- Output 5/Health: No evidence is provided that gender disparities actually exist in the treatment or morbidity and mortality of these diseases. Similarly, it is not clear how the training of female frontline workers, managers or the establishment of support groups are on the critical path to the realization of human rights or addressing gender-inequitable norms.
- Output 6/Health: There is a strong emphasis on various partnerships in the key areas of work, but there is no evidence provided that such partnership mechanisms have a track record of actually delivering the goods and speeding up progress in child health. Similarly, no evidence is cited that increasing the volume of lessons learned and the speed at which they are published and disseminated translates into accelerated progress in child health.
- Output 1/WASH: One of the shifts introduced for the strategy period is a focus on community-based water safety plans. The Theory of Change acknowledges water safety plans as a new programming focus with less well-developed strategies and that the approach depends on considerable investment in capacity development both among national governments and within UNICEF. No evidence is provided for the effectiveness of this approach. The Theory of Change acknowledges that close collaboration with partners is needed, as is the generation of lessons learned.
- Output 3/WASH: The use of sustainability compacts is prominent in the discussion. However, it isn't clear that there is an evidence base that these commitments have resulted in any demonstrable improvement in resource sustainability.

Annex 7

Summary of assumptions by Strategic Plan outcome

	Assumptions for outputs to outcomes	Assumptions for activities to outputs
Health	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health remains a priority at both global and national levels; 2. Opposition to routine immunizations and polio remains localized; 3. No significant new global threats to child health emerge; 4. Human resources for health are adequate to deliver health services. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. Communities remain open to receiving information and behaviour change messages; 1b. Ability to access communities to understand reasons behind refusals of vaccines; 2. Existence of minimum level of capacity that can be supported; 3. Partners are interested in developing their capacity in evidence-based programming and improving the health of the most disadvantaged; 4. No convergence of unmanageable numbers of crises simultaneously; 5. Shared understanding of the importance of human rights and gender equality; 6. No collapse in the global system of coordination and partnership.
HIV/AIDS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Political commitment and the accompanying resource allocation do not drop precipitously; 2. New technology does not revolutionize the response to HIV; 3. Stigma and discrimination do not increase significantly and cripple the response to HIV; 4. Drug resistance to antiretroviral drugs does not spread rapidly and widely. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communities remain open to receiving information and behaviour change messages; 2. Existence of minimum level of capacity that can be supported; 3. No significant increase in opposition to identifying the needs of adolescents (including key populations) through better data; 4a. No convergence of unmanageable numbers of crises simultaneously; 4b. Functional coordination systems in emergencies to integrate HIV into cluster work; 5. Continued understanding of importance of gender equality and human rights despite drop in stigma and discrimination; 6. No collapse in the global system of coordination and partnership (particularly UNAIDS).

	Assumptions for outputs to outcomes	Assumptions for activities to outputs
WASH	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Government capacity, including financial and human resources, and political commitment are adequate to deliver and sustain WASH services; 2. The enabling environment provides the necessary conditions for service providers (private and/or public) to deliver cost-effective WASH services; 3. Delivering services to disadvantaged populations is given funding priority. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. Communities are receptive to receiving information; 1b. Other issues (e.g. spread of a new disease) do not divert attention; 1c. Important stakeholders are receptive to new focus on water safety planning; 2a. A minimal level of capacity exists within government and partnerships such that capacity development efforts are not rendered useless; 2b. Poor coordination does not result in system-weakening inefficiencies; 3. Government and partners incorporate new evidence into sector plans and then operationalize these plans; 4a. Although possible, no large number of humanitarian crises occur in rapid succession thereby overwhelming the organization's ability to respond; 4b. Coordination problems do not worsen to the point that they undermine effectiveness; 5a. Communities, national partners and donors understand the human rights approach and gender mainstreaming imperative for WASH outcomes; 5b. Evidence and disaggregated data are available to help identify the most disadvantaged and hard-to-reach communities; 6. The global system of coordination and partnership does not collapse and be replaced with increased competition and rivalry.
Nutrition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Political leaders will continue to promote and support efforts to scale up nutrition and improve equity; 2. Global food prices do not increase dramatically; 3. The number of humanitarian crises remains limited. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communities are open to receiving information, behaviour change messages and other efforts to change sociocultural beliefs and practices. There is always a risk that other issues (e.g., geopolitical conflict, the spread of a new disease) could divert focus from nutrition, making communities less responsive; 2. A minimum level of capacity exists within governments and other partners so that capacity development efforts are not rendered useless through the absence of human resources with whom UNICEF can engage; 3a. Government and partners incorporate newly generated evidence about what works into sector plans; 3b. Government and partners have sufficient capacity and commitment to translate these changes into operational improvements, particularly in ways that prioritize delivery to disadvantaged populations; 4a. Because of the unpredictability of humanitarian crises, there is always a possibility that a large number will occur in rapid succession, overwhelming the organization's ability to respond; 4b. Coordination problems will not worsen dramatically to the point that they completely undermine the effectiveness of interventions; 5. UNICEF's partners understand the importance of employing a rights-based and gender-sensitive approach to nutrition programming; 6. The global system of coordination and partnership does not collapse and be replaced by increased competition and rivalry.

	Assumptions for outputs to outcomes	Assumptions for activities to outputs
Education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Availability of quality data and evidence continues to increase, in particular regarding the education and learning of the most disadvantaged groups; 2. Receptiveness on the part of the education community to put more emphasis on learning outcomes and their measurement; 3. Funding gaps in education do not widen; 4. Limited resources are reprioritized to support early childhood and basic education. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communities with which UNICEF is working are open to receiving information, behaviour change messages and other efforts to change sociocultural beliefs and practices and to engage parents and others more fully in education; 2. A minimum level of capacity exists such that capacity development efforts do not falter due to, for example, an absence of teachers, or that innovative new approaches do not collapse because staff are so overstretched that they are unable to focus on learning new areas; 3. Shifts in laws and policies will be reflected in operational changes in the functioning of education systems; 4. Because of the unpredictability of humanitarian crises, there is always a possibility that a large number will occur in rapid succession, overwhelming the organization's ability to respond; 5. A global movement that challenges the basic principles of gender equality and human rights will not emerge and start influencing policies and resource allocation over the period 2014-2017; 6. Global system of coordination and partnership does not collapse and be replaced by increased competition and rivalry.
Child Protection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Governments and other stakeholders recognize that all children have the right to be protected from violence, exploitation and abuse; 2. Governments are willing and able to make meaningful financial investments in child protection; 3. Key stakeholders continue to recognize the benefits of a holistic approach; 4. Efforts to change social and communal norms are not broadly undermined by spurious allegations about the motivations of UNICEF and other actors. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communities with which UNICEF is working are open to receiving information, behaviour change messages and other efforts to change sociocultural beliefs and practices; 2. A minimum level of capacity exists within governments and other partners so that capacity development efforts are not rendered useless through the absence of human resources with whom UNICEF can engage; 3. Political commitment exists not only to address gaps in laws and policies but also to translate them into concrete improvements in the functioning of child protection systems; 4. The unpredictability of humanitarian crises: there is always a possibility that a large number will occur in rapid succession, overwhelming the organization's ability to respond; 5. Communities, national partners and donors understand the importance of employing an approach to child protection that is based on human rights and gender equality; 6. The global system of coordination and partnership does not collapse and be replaced by increased competition and rivalry.

	Assumptions for outputs to outcomes	Assumptions for activities to outputs
Social Inclusion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. International and national leaders continue to embrace the concept of social inclusion; 2. Increasing participation by children and communities affected by a particular decision increases their inclusion in society; 3. Well-designed systems are better at identifying and addressing the needs of disadvantaged populations; 4. Partners remain willing to work in multi-sectoral ways. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Openness from communities to receiving information and behaviour change messages; 2. Existence of minimum level of capacity that can be supported; 3a. Governments are interested in addressing social inclusion in an evidence-based manner; 3b. Non-traditional partners are willing to engage on issues of social inclusion; 4a. No convergence of unmanageable numbers of crisis simultaneously; 4b. Coordination in humanitarian settings does not collapse; 5. Partners continue to accept that human rights and gender equality approaches are critical for sustainable, inclusive development; 6. No collapse in the global system of coordination and partnership.

Annex 8

Indicator analyses

Impact	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or source identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
1: Health										
1a. Under-five mortality rate (as pledged in A Promise Renewed)	3	3	3	1	Y	Y	3	Y		2012 baseline is a projection; measurement subject to significant lag time
1b. Neonatal mortality rate	3	3	3	1	Y	Y	1	Y		2012 baseline is a projection
2: HIV and AIDS										
2a. Number of new HIV infections among children under 15 years (2012 United Nations General Assembly Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS)	3	3	3	2	N	Y	3	Y		Computed through modeling not measurement
2b. Percentage of children under 15 years with access to HIV prevention and treatment	3	2	3	2	Y	Y	3	Y		Definition of 'access' can vary between countries
3: Water, sanitation and hygiene										
3a. Proportion of population practicing open defecation	3	3	3	1	Y	Y	3	Y		Definitions and methods are overseen by WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP). As measured through household surveys, the indicator is available for a given country every three to five years. The JMP reports trends in 5 and 10 year intervals. Appears that the baseline data (2012) is for the world, including both developed and developing countries. Target is derived from global goal for the year 2025. As impact indicators, perhaps sensitivity to change is less critical?
3b. Proportion of population using an improved source of drinking water	3	3	3	1	Y	Y	3	Y		Definitions and methods are overseen by WHO/UNICEF JMP. As measured through household surveys, the indicator is available for a given country every three to five years. The JMP reports trends in 5 and 10 year intervals. Appears that the baseline data (2012) is for the world, including both developed and developing countries. Target derived from global goal for the year 2025.
4: Nutrition										

4a. Number of children under 5 years who are moderately and severely stunted	3	3	3	3		Y	2	Y		While target is based on international agreements, it is stated as for 2022 but appears to be 2025 (based on website) - beyond strategy period. Unclear what is meant by 'all countries' as the universe.
4b. Percentage of women of reproductive age with anemia	3	3	3	1		Y	1	Y		Detailed indicator sheet specifies that this is to be measured in countries where anemia is classified as a severe public health issue. Baseline (if drawn from website) appears to be for all WHO regions and not limited to countries meeting the severe criteria; based on 2005 data (?). Furthermore, the number of countries meeting severe criteria differ for pregnant and non-pregnant women. Further elaboration of these countries should be provided. Frequency of update is yet to be determined. No target specified to date.
5: Education										
5a. Number of primary school-age children out of school and related gender parity index (GPI)	3	3	3	3		Y	2	Y	G	Target developed through trends analysis and aims for a reduction in out-of-school children from 57 million to zero. Even as a jointly achieved impact it seems overly ambitious.
5b. Primary completion rate (expressed as Gross Intake Ratio in the last grade of primary) and related GPI	3	3	3	3		Y	3	Y	G	
6: Child protection										
6a. Number of violent deaths per 100,000 children	3	2	3	1		Y	1	U		Acknowledged proxy of intentional homicide for violent deaths. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) validates data, which is generated from three possible sources. Data is reported for all countries in the UNODC for 193 countries and 26 territories inclusive of all income categories. Rates per 100,000 unlikely to be sensitive to change. Not clear that SDG goal indicator would be pegged specifically to children.
6b. Percentage of women 20-24 who were married or in a union by age 18	3	3	3	1		Y	1	Y	G	Considerable lag time impedes the sensitivity of the indicator (e.g. baseline reported for the period 2005-2012). Target for indicator is as yet unspecified but indicator highly likely to be included among SDG goals.
6c. Percentage of children under 5 whose birth is registered	3	3	3	3		Y	1	Y		Target for indicator is as yet unspecified but indicator highly likely to be included among SDG goals.
7: Social inclusion										
7a. Number of countries where social protection systems have a positive impact on children's well-being	3	2	3	2	Y	Y	2	N	Q	
7b. Number of countries that have ratified the CRC and its Optional Protocols, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	3	3	1	2	Y	Y	1	N	G H	Ratification of treaties/policy generally output or outcome
7c. Number of children living in extreme poverty	3	3	3	2	Y	Y	3	Y	Q	Indicator will be estimated/modeled

P1. Outcome: Improved and equitable use of high-impact maternal and child health interventions from pregnancy to adolescence and promotion of healthy behaviours.	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or source identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P1.1 Countries with at least 80 per cent of live births attended by a skilled health personnel (doctor, nurse, midwife or auxiliary midwife)	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		Measured only periodically
P1.2 Countries with at least 80 per cent of women attended at least four times during their pregnancy by any provider (skilled or unskilled) for reasons related to the pregnancy	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		Measured only periodically
P1.3 Countries that are verified/validated as having eliminated maternal and neonatal tetanus	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y	-	Impact level result
P1.4 Polio-endemic or newly infected countries that become polio-free	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y	-	Impact level result
P1.5 Countries with at least 90 per cent coverage at national level, at least 80 per cent coverage in every district or equivalent administrative unit for children < 1 year receiving (a) measles-containing vaccine, (b) DTP containing vaccine	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y	-	
P1.6 Countries with at least 80 per cent of children aged 0-59 months with diarrhea receiving oral rehydration salts	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		
P1.7 Countries with at least 80 per cent of children aged 0-59 months with symptoms of pneumonia taken to an appropriate health provider	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		
P1.8 Countries with at least 80 per cent of children aged 0-59 months with fever who had a finger- or heel-stick for malaria testing	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		
P1.9 Malaria-endemic countries with at least 80 per cent of children aged 0-59 months sleeping under an insecticide-treated net	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		
P1.10 Countries with at least 60 per cent of a) mothers and b) newborns receiving postnatal care within two days of childbirth	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		

Output a: Enhanced support for children and caregivers, from pregnancy to adolescence, for improved healthy behaviours											
P1.a.1 Countries in which a maternal, newborn and child health communication plan has been developed, budgeted and implemented	1	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	N	-	Detailed indicator sheet permits countries to answer 'yes' even if plan not implemented	
Output b: Increased national capacity to provide access to essential high-impact maternal and child health interventions											
P1.b.1 Countries without stock outs lasting more than one month at national level for oral rehydration salts	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	N	-	Challenging to measure reliably and repeatedly without health facility surveys being done	
Output c: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for scaling up of health interventions											
P1.c.1 Countries in which barriers and bottlenecks related to child survival are monitored in at least 80 per cent of DHSS targeted districts	3	2	3	Y	Y	Y	2	N	-	Numerator may be difficult to determine with consistency	
Output d: Increased country capacity and delivery of services to prevent excess mortality among girls, boys and women in humanitarian situations											
Output e: Increased capacity of governments and partners, as duty-bearers, to identify and respond to key human rights and gender equality dimensions of maternal and child health											
Output f: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress in child health											

P2. Outcome: Improved and equitable use of proven HIV prevention and treatment interventions by children, pregnant women and adolescents	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or source identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P2.1 Countries with at least 80 per cent coverage of antiretroviral treatment (ART) among eligible children aged 0-14 years and eligible adolescent girls and boys aged 10-19 years	3	2	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y	G	Compound indicator - needs further disambiguation than exists in indicator sheets

P2.2 Countries providing at least 80 per cent coverage of triple drug regimens for all pregnant women living with HIV	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y		Revised indicator reads "Countries providing at least 80 per cent coverage of lifelong ART for all pregnant women living with HIV"
P2.3 Countries where at least 50 per cent of the overall HIV and AIDS budget is funded through domestic resources	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	1	Y		There is a discrepancy between the results framework and the indicator sheets on whether or not there is a target for this indicator
P2.4 Countries with at least a 60 per cent coverage in condom use at last sexual encounter among adolescents aged 15-19 years reporting multiple partners in last year	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y		
P2.5 Number and percentage of people in humanitarian situations who have access to HIV prevention and treatment										This indicator has been dropped according to the indicator sheets
Output a: Enhanced support for children and caregivers for healthy behaviours related to HIV and AIDS and to use of relevant services, consistent with UNAIDS Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework										
Output b: Increased national capacity to provide access to essential service delivery systems for scaling up HIV interventions										
P2.b.1 Countries with at least 80 per cent of eligible adolescents 10-19 years receiving voluntary male medical circumcision	3	3	2	Y	Y	Y	3	Y		Coverage usually at outcome level
Output c: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget to scale up HIV and AIDS prevention and treatment interventions										
P2.c.4 Countries with either a national child protection strategy or a national social protection strategy that includes elements focused on HIV	2	2	2	Y	Y	Y	3	N	Q	The indicator instructions require several subjective judgments to be made about some of the criteria (e.g. 'Protection from violence, abuse, or exploitation; Reduction in gender inequity and harmful social norms that place girls at risk of increased HIV infection)
Output d: Increased country capacity and delivery of services to ensure vulnerability to HIV infection is not increased and HIV-related care, support and treatment needs are met in humanitarian situations										
P2.d.1 Number and percentage of HIV-positive pregnant women (out of those targeted by UNICEF) in humanitarian situations who receive treatment (either initiated or continuing) to prevent mother-to-child-transmission of HIV	3	2	2	Y	Y	N	2	N	H	The indicator presents significant practical measurement challenges. Numbers of pregnant women receiving treatment is not inherently interpretable. Percentage as defined does not correspond to the wording of the indicator
Output e: Increased capacity of governments and partners, as duty-bearers, to identify and respond to key human rights and gender equality dimensions of HIV and AIDS										

P2.e.1 Countries with national household survey based data on HIV disaggregated by age and sex collected within the preceding five years	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y	G
Output f: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress in HIV and AIDS									

P3. Outcome: Improved and equitable use of safe drinking water, sanitation, and improved hygiene practices	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or source identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P3.1 Countries in which more than 75 per cent of households have an improved source of drinking water	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y		JMP agreed methods and verification.
P3.2 Countries in which more than 50 per cent of the population has an improved sanitation facility	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y		JMP agreed methods and verification.
P3.3 Countries in which more than 50 per cent of primary schools have WASH facilities meeting national standards	3	2	3	?	Y	Y	3	N		Several aspects of the indicator could be more fully defined. For example, national standards will, of course, vary across countries. In interpreting the indicator, it would be beneficial to have a record of those standards. The systems through which the data is collected in countries is not outlined and is assumed to be of variable quality. Because of these uncertainties, the sensitivity to change is indicated as ?.
P3.4 Countries in which more than 20 per cent of households have appropriate hand-washing facilities (Now: Countries increasing by 10 per cent the proportion of households with appropriate hand washing facilities)	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	2	Y		Indicator has been re-worded to countries with a 10 per cent (or more) increase in the proportion of households with appropriate hand washing facilities. As data is generated with household surveys, not all countries will be able to measure 10 per cent increase over baseline due to the size of the confidence interval. This limitation is more related to the target and not sensitivity of the indicator
P3.5 Countries in which more than 33 per cent of the population practices open defecation	3	3	3	Y	Y	Y	3	Y		JMP agreed methods and verification.
P3.6 Number and percentage of people in humanitarian situations who access and use (a) safe drinking water, (b) adequate sanitation and hygiene facilities, (c) hand washing facilities	3	3	3	Y	Y	N	3	Y	H	Three separate indicators not to be compiled or compounded in any manner. Definitions adapted from CCCs and guidance provided in Humanitarian Performance Monitoring indicator guide. Baseline is identified as 'NA'. Not clear how this can be calculated going forward but no baseline can be constructed.

P3.e.1 Countries with national monitoring systems reporting on equity of access to WASH services	2	2	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	Q	Indicator definition is a re-statement of the indicator name with further specification of disaggregation. Indicator is open to interpretation as country office answers Y/N to the following: "Does the country have national monitoring systems reporting on equity of access to WASH service include disaggregated coverage data on at least one geographical population group (rural/urban, sub-national divisions, such as districts or provinces) AND at least one social population group (rich-poor, minority populations such as ethnicity or religion, or vulnerabilities including people with disabilities)? " Target set through expert consultation. QA is via COAR/SMQ review.
Output f: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress in safe water, sanitation and hygiene practices										
P3.f.1 Number of peer reviewed journal or research publications by UNICEF on WASH and children	3	3	2	3	Y	Y	3	N		The indicator includes publications reported by the country office through the COAR/SMQ so may not be entirely specific to the global and regional programme output.

P4. Outcome: Improved and equitable use of nutritional support and improved nutrition and care practices	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or source identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P4.1 Countries with a current exclusive breastfeeding rate among children 0-5 months old \geq 50 per cent and no recent significant decline	3	3	3	2	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Significant decline is defined as 10 per cent in the DIS. Baseline covers the period 2007-2012. Measuring change on an annual basis against a baseline with seven years of data may diminish sensitively to change. DIS notes that "The aim of this target is to both decrease countries without data, while also increasing number with >50 per cent exclusive breastfeeding". It is unclear how countries with newly acquired data would affect the count unless they enter the data set with a value \leq 50 per cent. Finally, as the figures are based on household survey data, it may not be possible to measure a 10 per cent reduction in a statistically significant manner.
P4.2 Countries with at least 90 per cent of households consuming adequately iodized salt	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Baseline covers the period 2007-2012. Measuring change on an annual basis against a baseline with seven years of data may diminish sensitively to change.

P4.3 Countries with at least 80 per cent of primary caregivers engaged in early childhood stimulation for under three-year olds at home.	3	3	3	3	3	Y	1	Y	N	Indicator is measured only through the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS). An estimated 52 countries will conduct a MICS5 during the period 2012-2015. Although a target appears in the results framework, the DIS indicates that a target is yet to be established.
P4.4 Countries with at least 90 per cent of children 6-59 months covered with two annual doses of vitamin A supplements	3	2	3	3	Y	Y	3		N	Approximation of two dose coverage based on administrative recording of distributions. Assumption is that child who receives the first dose also received the second and that children missed are missed in both distributions. The lower of the two coverage rates (first, second dose) is used for reporting. UNICEF and its partners are working to develop more refined methods for measuring the proportion of children fully protected
P4.5 Number and percentage of children between 6-59 months affected by severe acute malnutrition, a) reached with quality treatment; b) recovery of > 75 per cent; and c) reduction of mortality (report separately for humanitarian situations). This indicator has been revised: Number and percentage of children between 6-59 months affected by severe acute malnutrition reached with quality treatment, defined as children who recovered (report separately for humanitarian situations)	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	H	Guided by SPHERE standards, there is no target set for number of children to be treated. The SPHERE standard threshold for defining the recovery rate is >75 per cent, applied in emergency and non-emergency contexts. Targets have not been provided for the revised indicator.
Output a: Enhanced support for children and caregivers and communities for improved nutrition and care practices.										
P4.a.1 Countries with capacities to provide infant and young child feeding counselling services to at least 70 per cent of communities	3	2	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Indicator is reported through the COAR ideally substantiated with ministry of health administrative data. Several aspects of the indicator (i.e. identifying communities within 5 km of a health provider or community worker who has been trained on infant and young child feeding within the past four years) introduce a degree of detail that would be difficult to measure reliably. Data may be verified through the NutriDash data system.
Output c: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for scaling-up nutrition interventions										
P4.c.3 Countries that have a nutrition sector plan or policy developed or revised that includes a risk management strategy to address disaster/crisis risks (e.g. natural disaster/climate/conflict)	3	3	2	3	Y	Y	2	Y	E	No information provided on target setting.
Output d: Increased country capacity and delivery of services to ensure protection of the nutritional status of girls, boys and women from effects of humanitarian situations										

P4.d.1 Number and percentage of UNICEF-targeted children aged 6-59 months with severe acute malnutrition in humanitarian situations are admitted to programmes for management of acute malnutrition and recover	3	3	3	3	Y	N	1	Y	H	The criteria of 75 per cent recovery is drawn from international standards. However, The results framework only states "Recovery rate > 75 per cent" for both baseline and target. It isn't clear whether a target has been set in terms of the number and percentage of children.
Output e: Increased capacity of governments and partners, as duty-bearers, to identify and respond to key human rights and gender equality dimensions of nutrition										
P4.e.2 Countries that have undertaken a gender review of the nutrition policy/strategy in the current national development plan cycle with UNICEF support	3	3	2	2	Y	Y	2	Y	G	Newly constructed indicator. Little/no experience with its collection and questions about the type of results represented. No information in target setting provided in DIS.
Output f: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress in child nutrition										

P5. Outcome: Improved learning outcomes and equitable and inclusive education	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or source identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P5.1 Countries with primary/lower secondary school age out-of-school rate below 5 per cent	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	
P5.2 Countries with increasing learning outcomes	3	3	3	2	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Measurement is conducted at country level every four to five years. Baseline is established based on countries with data for the past six years and will be updated as new data becomes available.
P5.3 Countries with at least 20 per cent of government expenditure on education	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Note results framework indicator has 30 per cent expenditure instead of 20 per cent. The baseline and targets in the results framework will therefore need to be adjusted.
P5.4 Countries with poorest quintile attendance rate: - above 80 per cent in primary education - above 25 per cent in early childhood education	3	3	3	2	Y	Y	3	Y	Q	Two separate indicators measured through household surveys. Estimate for primary education attendance is a rolling average covering a six-year period; early childhood development is a rolling average based on the previous nine years. Estimation intervals (six years, nine years) can diminish sensitivity to change.

P.5.5 Programme countries in which at least 80 per cent of children aged 36-59 months have been engaged in activities with an adult to promote learning and school readiness	3	3	3	2	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Indicator is measured by rolling average based on the previous nine years. Estimation interval (nine years) can diminish sensitivity to change.
P.5.6 Number and percentage of children in humanitarian situations accessing formal or non-formal basic education (including pre-primary schools/early childhood learning spaces)§	3	3	3	3	Y	N	2	Y	H	Indicator specifies that the children reached are those reached by all partners and not only UNICEF. Two filter questions used in COAR (did country office respond?, was education cluster activated); answer must be "yes" to both. Other sectors (WASH) with humanitarian action outcome indicators do not specifically state "all partners" and output-level humanitarian action indicators state "UNICEF-targeted". Consistency checks across these varying denominators will be needed. No baseline provided ("NA"); target provided but with no discussion of method for target setting.
Output a: Enhanced support to communities with disadvantaged and excluded children to start schooling at the right age and attend regularly										
P5.a.1 Countries with functional school management committees at primary and secondary level	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	N	Section has created a set of three criteria on functionality of the school management committees and a four point score rubric for each. Target based on assumption of potential movement across the four point matrix - specifically movement from score two to score three (passing the threshold of non-functional to functional).
Output b: Increased national capacity to provide access to early learning opportunities and quality primary and secondary education										
P5.b.2 Countries with quality standards consistent with child-friendly schools/education or similar models developed or revised	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	N	Section has created a set of two criteria on functionality of child friendly schools/education and a four point score rubric for each. Target based on assumption of potential movement across the four point matrix - specifically movement from score two to score three (passing the threshold of non-functional to functional).
Output c: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for scaling-up quality and inclusive education										
P5.c.1 Countries with well-functioning student learning assessment system, especially for early grades	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	N	Section has created a set of three criteria on functionality of the learning assessment system and a four point score rubric for each. Target based on assumption of potential movement across the four point matrix - specifically movement from score two to score three (passing the threshold of non-functional to functional).

Output d: Increased country capacity and delivery of services to ensure girls and boys access to safe and secure forms of education and critical information for their own well-being in humanitarian situations											
P5.d.3 Countries in humanitarian action where country cluster or sector coordination mechanism for education meet CCC standards for coordination										H	This indicator no longer appears in the DIS (?). Perhaps as it had no relevance to increased capacity of government and partners.
Output e: Increased capacity of governments and partners, as duty-bearers, to identify and respond to key human rights and gender equality dimensions of school readiness and performance											
P5.e.2 Countries with education management information systems providing disaggregated data that allow identification of barriers and bottlenecks that inhibit realization of the rights of disadvantaged children	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	N		Section has created a set of three criteria on functionality of the school management committees and a four point score rubric for each. Target based on assumption of potential movement across the four point matrix - specifically movement from score two to score three (passing the threshold of non-functional to functional).
Output f: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress in education											

P6. Outcome: Improved and equitable prevention of and response to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect of children	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or source identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P6.1 Countries with 10 per cent reduction in proportion of girls 15-17 years who have ever experienced sexual violence (forced to have sexual intercourse), in countries with prevalence of at least 5 per cent	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	G	As with other indicators with a targeted 10 per cent reduction, there may be difficulties in measuring change due to the confidence intervals inherent in estimated generated through sample surveys. The target is describes as ambitious but no information provided on how it was established. Baseline is worded as "out of 24 countries with data" suggesting that the target would be a 10 per cent reduction in four of those 24 countries (i.e. repeat survey required).

P6.2 Countries with 10 per cent reduction in proportion of children 2-14 (1-14) years who experience violent disciplinary practices by an adult member of the household [definition will change by 2017 to ages 1-14 years]	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	As with other indicators with a targeted 10 per cent reduction, there may be difficulties in measuring change due to the confidence intervals inherent in estimated generated through sample surveys. Baseline is worded as "out of 53 countries with data" suggesting that the target would be a 10 per cent reduction in 10 of those 53 countries. (i.e. repeats survey required).
P6.3 Countries with 20 per cent reduction in number of children in detention per 100,000 child population	3	3	3	1	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Indicator is included in international guidance on juvenile justice reform. Target was identified in consultation with regional office advisors. However, based on review of UNODC data, these figures vary tremendously from year to year (in both directions) and a single year reduction may not part of any consistent downward trend.
P6.4 Countries with 30 per cent or more reduction in proportion of girls 0-14 years undergoing female genital mutilation/cutting	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	G	
P6.5 Countries with 20 per cent reduction in proportion of children 5-14 years involved in child labour, in countries with prevalence of at least 10 per cent (definition will change by 2017 to refer to ages 5-17 years)	3	3	2	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	While child labour is referenced in the Theory of Change, it does not appear to be a programme focus area. While outcome-level results are jointly achieved, the agency should have some discernible stream of activities which could be considered contributory.
P6.6 Countries with 20% reduction in proportion of children in residential care (out of all children in formal care)	3	2	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	This indicator appears to be relevant to those countries where the Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children are being implemented. Elements of the indicator definition may be open to varying interpretation in country offices. DIS states that relatively few countries have data on formal non-residential care, thus making the computation of the data for all countries relatively difficult. Therefore, the target was established as 30 countries out of the 113 countries with data 2010-2012.
P6.7 Countries with 10 per cent reduction in proportion of women 20-24 years married by age 18 years, in countries with prevalence of at least 25 per cent	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	G	
P6.8 Percentage of parties to conflict listed in the annex to the Secretary-General's report on children and armed conflict that enter into action plans to end grave violations against children	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	H	Target is set at 100 per cent as "The assumption is that UNICEF and partners would work towards 100 per cent compliance among those listed parties."
Output a: Enhanced support and increased capacities of children and families to protect themselves and to eliminate practices and behaviours harmful to children										
Output b: Increased national capacity to provide access to child protection systems that prevent and respond to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect										

P6.b.3 Countries in which procedures and services for children in contact with law are applied and delivered in line with international norms	2	2	3	3	Y	Y	2	Y	N	DIS makes no reference to the relevant "international norms". Indicator definition mentions elements including "development of child friendly investigations, trial and sentencing procedures by police, prosecutors, defense counsel and judges, including the use of specialized courts and special protection measures for children and witnesses". However, methods and computation do not indicate whether these all elements must be present. No description provided for "applied" and "delivered". Open to subjectivity by country office respondents. No information provided on target setting.
Output c: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for scaling up interventions that prevent and respond to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect										
Output d: Increased country capacity and delivery of services to ensure that children's rights to protection from violence, abuse and exploitation are sustained and promoted in humanitarian situations										
P6.d.3 Number and percentage of UNICEF-targeted children and women in humanitarian situations who experience sexual violence and receive multi-sectoral support services (e.g. health, psychosocial, livelihood/economic strengthening and justice)	2	2	3	3	Y	N	3	Y	H	DIS suggests that this is actually two different indicators with separate numerators and denominators a) for girls and boys and b) for women). However, in the SMQ, questions cover these groups together: e.g. "What is the number of children (girls and boys) and women targeted for sexual violence support services? [Footnote 12] (Provide disaggregated data by age in remarks column, if available.)" Data quality depends on two separate reporting systems: the COAR for numerator information (UNICEF-targeted populations) and the Gender-Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS) for denominator data. Care is needed to see that countries where the GBVIMS operates corresponds to countries/areas targeted with a UNICEF Humanitarian Action for Children appeal.
Output e: Increased capacity of governments and communities to identify and respond to human rights and gender dimensions of child protection										
P6.e.1 Countries that collect and publish routine administrative data on violence, exploitation and abuse of children, including violent deaths and injuries	3	3	2	3	Y	Y	3	Y	N	Indicator seems inconsistent with the following statement from the DIS: "Improving the overall quality of data is a priority for the section in the new Strategic Plan and an increase to 75 countries in total by 2017 would signify excellent progress over the course of the new Strategic Plan." The indicator aims to expand the number of countries able to report rather than the quality of that data.

P6.e.2 Countries that have revised or improved child protection policies on the basis of a gender review supported by UNICEF	3	3	3	3	Y	Y	3	Y	G	Countries in which the UNICEF-assisted country programme has undertaken a gender analysis of key child protection issues within the current country programme cycle and child protection related policy has been revised or improved on the basis of the gender analysis.
Output f: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress in child protection										

P7. Outcome: Improved policy environment and systems for disadvantaged and excluded children, guided by improved knowledge and data	Indicator defined?	Indicator reliably measurable?	Is indicator specific?	Is indicator sensitive to change?	System or Source Identified	Baseline specified	Target specified	Quality	Pertains to crosscutting priority	Comment
P7.1 Countries with <i>disaggregated</i> national household survey data on birth registration collected within the preceding 5 years (such as MICS, DHS, etc.)	3	3	2	Y	Y	Y	1	N	G	Data availability generally an output Measurement and data requirements extremely complex Definition of "consulted" can vary across humanitarian situations
P7.2 Countries that expand the number of children covered by social protection systems	2	1	3	Y	Y	N	3	N	Q	
P7.3 Countries with improved capacity to develop, implement and finance integrated social protection systems	2	1	3	?	Y	N	3	N	Q	
P7.4 Countries in which social spending on a per capita basis is being maintained or increasing	2	2	3	?	Y	Y	3	N	Q	
P7.5 Countries in humanitarian situations that systematically consult affected populations as part of humanitarian performance monitoring	3	2	2	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N	H	
Output a: Enhanced support for disadvantaged and marginalized children and families to use social protection systems and participate in decision-making processes affecting them										Indicator cannot be reliably measured or defined through current specification
P7.a.1 Countries with functional mechanism for participation of children to influence development agendas in the local, subnational or national plans that affect the most disadvantaged and marginalized	1	1	1	?	Y	Y	1	N	Q	

Output b: Increased national capacity to provide access to inclusive systems that protect children and adolescents from poverty and promote social inclusion											
Output c: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for inclusive social policies and social protection measures, including in risk-prone and fragile contexts											Rubrics for categorizing countries are clear but complicated
P7.c.1 Countries with policy and/or budgetary frameworks that explicitly address child poverty and disparities	3	2	3	?	Y	Y	3	N	Q		
Output d: Improved country capacity and national systems to promote resilience and strengthen response to humanitarian situations											
Output e: Increased capacity of governments and partners, as duty-bearers, to identify and respond to key human rights and gender equality dimensions of social inclusion											
Output f: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress towards social inclusion											

<p>Legend</p> <p>Indicator defined 1= not defined, or defined with one or more elements of a highly subjective manner 2= all indicator components clearly defined with some elements of subjectivity remaining 3= all indicator components clearly and objectively defined; little or no room for subjectivity</p> <p>Indicator reliably measured 1 = poorly constructed; framed in immeasurable manner; or measurability unclear even from specifications provided 2= indicatory with weak specification or source; or dependent on subjective assessment (e.g. by country office staff person) 3= clear or standard indicator easily measured using well-established practice</p> <p>Indicator specific 1= Mismatch between type of results expected and indicator (impact, outcome, output) 2= Possible relationship to type of results anticipated (impact, outcome, output) 3= Indicator matches type of result anticipated (impact, outcome, output)</p> <p>Target specified 1= No description of how target was set or no target 2= Target based on expert opinion with no further explanation 3= Target set through transparent process and/or aligned with global or regional commitment</p>

Annex 9

Regional office priorities (as per Regional Office Management Plans)

Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office¹

In April 2014, the Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Management Team identified five programmatic priorities to focus cross-country action and learning as well as to reinforce joint accountability:

1. Enabling children to survive and thrive.
2. Reducing stunting to provide opportunities for children to realize their full potential.
3. Improving education quality and learning outcomes to prepare children for the future.
4. Achieving results for adolescents that help them manage risks and realize their full potential.
5. Scaling up social protection interventions to reduce child poverty and other vulnerabilities that impede the full realization of child rights.

The regional priorities reinforce the country-specific priorities outlined in CPDs and agreed to with national counterparts. The priorities also articulate what the UNICEF ESA team will contribute as a region to the achievement of organization-wide Strategic Plan results.

Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office²

The main equity-focused results for children expected to be achieved in the region, to which the Regional Office will contribute in 2014-2017³ by supporting LAC country offices, are:

- The reduction of neonatal mortality, as well as pregnancies among adolescents;
- The virtual elimination of the vertical transmission of HIV and its reduction among adolescents;
- The positioning of child and maternal nutrition at the core of national development plans;
- Expanded pre-school education, improved learning and reduced drop out among adolescents;
- Free and universal birth registration and expanded child protection services; and
- The reduction of multi-dimensional child poverty.

¹ UNICEF, Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office Management Plan 2014-2017 (updated 4 September 2014).

² UNICEF, Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office (LACRO) Regional Office Management Plan 2014-2017 (revised 23 September 2014).

³ The support of UNICEF for the achievement of these outcomes in LAC depends on the availability of other resources funding for both country offices and LACRO.

Regional Office for South Asia⁴

ROSA's results for 2014-2017 establish explicit commitments to all seven of the impact results of the UNICEF Strategic Plan (health; HIV and AIDS; WASH; nutrition; education; child protection; and social inclusion) to significantly increase the numbers of children who survive and thrive in South Asia. While supporting the achievement of all Strategic Plan impact results, ROSA will direct particular leadership, representation and technical assistance in the region to achieve:

- Health: Eradication of the wild polio virus in Pakistan and Afghanistan and the official declaration that all countries in South Asia are polio free by 2017
- Sanitation: 120 million families per year will no longer practice open defecation
- Nutrition: 12 million children will be saved from stunting and its consequences by 2017
- Education: Equitable education systems that will address learning for marginalized children

In recognition of the challenges faced by adolescence and their potential in South Asia as agents of change, UNICEF will explicitly address this age group through increased support to country offices and enhanced capacity development. The region-wide result to be achieved by 2017 reflects the reality that this is a new programme area for a number of UNICEF offices in South Asia, and a re-focus for UNICEF globally.

- Adolescents: Country offices, governments and others regularly include a pro-adolescent dimension in their policy, programme, budget, research and assessment actions

Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States⁵

UNICEF's work in the region over the period 2014-2017 will focus on making the voices of excluded and marginalized children and adolescents heard. This concerted advocacy effort, which will aim to mobilize as well as build on existing collaboration with governments, parliaments, civil society, media, private sector and most importantly children and adolescents themselves, will be based on the results from the Regional Knowledge and Leadership Agenda, which was initiated during the current biennium. As part of this process, the Regional Management Team identified 10 priority result areas where significant advances can be made in realizing child rights and reducing equity gaps. The 10 priority results areas align closely to seven impact results identified in the 'Updated roadmap to and outline of the medium-term strategic plan for 2014-2017' (E/ICEF/2013-5).

1. Children's right to a family environment
2. Juvenile justice: children's right to support for reintegration into society
3. Children's right to education: early learning and school readiness
4. Children's right to education: including all children out of school in quality learning
5. Children's right to be born HIV free
6. Children's right to health: infant and under-five mortality
7. Integrated early child development 0-3 years old

⁴ UNICEF, Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA) Office Management Plan and Integrated Budget 2014-2017, 6 September 2013.

⁵ UNICEF, CEE/CIS Regional Office Management Plan 2014-2017 (updated to reflect decisions of the Global PBR in 2013).

8. Children's right to social protection
9. Disaster risk reduction
10. Second decade, second chance, adolescents

Annex 10

UNICEF Evaluation Management Response

Evaluation Title: Evaluability Assessment of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017

Region: Global

Office: Division of Data, Research & Policy (DRP)

Evaluation Year: May 2015

Person-In-Charge for Follow-up to Management Response: Jeffrey O'Malley, Director DRP/George Laryea-Adjei, Deputy Director DRP

Overall Response to the Evaluation: UNICEF welcomes the Evaluability Assessment, including its first key finding, that the Strategic Plan “is widely viewed as the most coherent and technically sound that UNICEF has developed to date.” The assessment’s findings and recommendations are all well-grounded in evidence. UNICEF also notes that the decision about whether future ‘Strategic Plans’ should be structured and presented as “plans” or “frameworks” should be made by the Executive Board. In addition to the management response described below, UNICEF looks forward to consulting with the Executive Board on UNICEF’s next ‘Strategic Plan’, including on alignment with the SDGs.

Planned Use of Evaluation: Recommendations from the Evaluability Assessment will inform the Mid Term Review of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 as well as the next ‘Strategic Plan’ 2018-2021.

Allowed Editor:

RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS:

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Reorient the Strategic Plan in line with its application as a framework. The evaluability assessment has found that the Strategic Plan is articulated logically as a plan but is applied in practice as a framework to better address national development priorities. Recognizing this, it is recommended that the next round of strategy development should more explicitly take account of the need for greater flexibility and adaptation. This should be fully considered and negotiated with key stakeholders, taking into consideration UNICEF’s modus operandi as a highly decentralized organization. The upcoming MTR should, in addition to assessing progress in implementation, further examine the implications of using a strategic framework approach for the 2018-2021 period and, accordingly, provide an indication of next steps.

Management Response: Agree

If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:					
Actions planned	Responsible Office	Expected completion date	Implementation stage: Not started Underway Completed Cancelled	Actions taken	Supporting documents
1. Prepare an Annotated Outline for the next UNICEF 'Strategic Plan' 2018-2021 for consultation with Executive Board and other stakeholders (that is consistent with the recommendations of the Evaluability Assessment on the SP as a Framework).	DRP (working with PD EMOPS, FRG, DFAM and ROs)	June 2017	Not started		
<p>Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2: Newly drafted CPDs and CPAPs should be reviewed in order to better understand how they relate and contribute to the Strategic Plan. With substantial regional office support, country offices are making efforts to adjust country programmes for better alignment with the Strategic Plan. Greater alignment of priorities and clarity of results could be facilitated through review of newly developed CPDs and CPAPs and sharing of lessons. This review process should aim to understand how well COs have used determinants analyses and other tools to focus programmes on the rights of the most disadvantaged and excluded children in the country context; and in turn, how well these country-determined foci align with results articulated in the Strategic Plan.</p>					
<p>Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Partially agree</p>					
<p>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons: With the adoption of the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Delivering as One in 2013, CPAPs are an optional feature in programming, hence not a basis for assessing programmes going forward. A review of CPDs in themselves will not be sufficient to assess overall alignment to the Strategic Plan. It will also not be adequate to gauge utilisation of determinant analysis for all programme sectors within the country programme. Such an analysis will require assessment of documentation beyond CPDs, including the new "Strategy Note" described below.</p>					
Actions planned	Responsible Office	Expected completion date	Implementation stage: Not started Underway Completed Cancelled	Actions taken	Supporting documents

1. Introduce requirement for future CPDs to be accompanied by a 'strategy note' for each programme component, which will outline in more detail the country level theory of change and its alignment to the corporate Strategic Plan.	FRG (with support from DRP and PD)	January 2016	Underway	Consultations with Regional Offices and other stakeholders at Istanbul Results Based Management workshop in October 2015 agreed in principle to new requirement for 'strategy notes'.	UNICEF internal document: 'Summary of Global Meeting: Advancing the Management for Results in UNICEF, Istanbul, 28 September – 1 October 2015.
2. Develop criteria for the review of alignment of CPDs and related documentation to the Strategic Plan.	FRG (with support from DRP and PD)	March 2016	Underway	Consultations ongoing with regional offices.	Draft Guidance on Strategy Note.
3. Undertake periodic reviews of CPDs in line with established criteria for alignment with the Strategic Plan and identification of good examples	FRG (with support from DRP and PD)	March 2016	Underway	Review of CPDs approved in 2015 was initiated in October 2015.	
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3: Clarify results, measurement approaches and indicators for equity. Equity is a central tenet of UNICEF's mission and thoroughly integrated in the Strategic Plan. However, there is a lack of clarity in the Strategic Plan on defining results relating to equity and how these will be measured. It is not necessary for UNICEF to have just one single definition of equity. However, all equity concepts that are employed need to be operationalized with sufficient clarity and rigor to allow measurement and evaluation.					
Management Response: Agree					
If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:					
Actions planned	Responsible Office	Expected completion date	Implementation stage: Not started Underway Completed Cancelled	Actions taken	Supporting documents

1. Two UNICEF publications - 'Progress for Children 2015' and 'A Fair Chance for Every Child' – have been published since the conclusion of the Evaluability Assessment, clarifying UNICEF understanding of various dimensions of equity, as well as summarizing progress. The report on the MTR of the Strategic Plan (2014-17) and the Data Companion will include further analysis of progress for the most disadvantaged children.	DRP/PD	March 2016	Underway	'Progress for Children 2015' and 'A Fair Chance for Every Child' have been published. Data collection for the MTR of the SP has commenced.	'Progress for Children 2015' and 'A Fair Chance for Every Child'
2. The MTR Report will reinforce a common understanding of equity and how this is translated in different contexts.	PD/DRP	March 2016	Underway	Data collection commenced.	
3. Equity-focused results and indicators will be strengthened in the next UNICEF 'Strategic Plan' 2018-2021	DRP/PD	September 2017	Not started		
<p>Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4: Conduct a review and adjust, as needed, indicators and systems to measure progress towards the results of the Strategic Plan. Extensive investments have been made in systems to report on the Strategic Plan indicators. At higher levels of the results chain (i.e. impact and outcome), UNICEF is a central contributor to global data sets, analytical work and methods development. Concerns related to indicator quality at these levels are limited. Performance indicators at the level of outputs are of more variable quality and, despite improvements, there are questions about the systems used to generate data. It is recommended an assessment of the quality of the output-level performance indicators is conducted with particular attention to those generated through the Country Office Annual Reporting system. Any further adjustments to indicators should be based on objective assessment of the performance of the COAR system. The review should be explicit about how results should be measured both the country and global level.</p>					
<p>Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Partially Agree</p>					
<p>If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons: Substantial improvements have already been made to improve the quality of indicators and the associated data collection system. The improvements include rewording of indicators for</p>					

ease of data collection, development of definitions and units of measurement for all indicators, creation of a new system for data collection, development of clear guidance to assist data collection, training of staff in Country Offices on the use of the new data collection tools, and increased quality assurance by Regional Office over country reporting processes. The Management Response will therefore focus on remaining steps on improving the system for reporting on the indicators of the Strategic Plan.

Actions planned	Responsible Office	Expected completion date	Implementation stage: Not started Underway Completed Cancelled	Actions taken	Supporting documents
1. Further refine the Results Framework of the Strategic Plan on the basis of updated indicators, baselines and targets.	DRP	April 2016	Underway	UNICEF made a case to the Executive Board in March 2015 about rewording of selected indicators and modification of baselines and targets, as informed by new data from the improved systems. The Executive Board agreed that, on the basis of the improvements made, a revised Results Framework should be presented at its Annual Session in June 2016.	Concept note on the Mid Term Review of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017; colour-coded Results Framework identifying areas for refinement, as shared with the Executive Board in December 2015.

				Process underway to adjust baselines and targets of the Strategic Plan on the basis of improved data.	
2. On the basis of a refined Results Framework, introduce a corporate scorecard on progress towards the results of the Strategic Plan.	DRP	April 2016	Underway	Development of templates underway.	
<u>Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:</u> Conduct an exercise to determine the need and feasibility of moving the organization towards budgeting practices more supportive of results-based management that enable better linking of resources and results. Currently, the Strategic Plan's integrated budget relies on projections of resource availability (i.e. means-based budget). The organization should explore various ways of linking results to resources and capacity.					
Management Response: Agree					
If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:					
Actions planned	Responsible Office	Expected completion date	Implementation stage: Not started Underway Completed Cancelled	Actions taken	Supporting documents
1. Review RBB approaches and practices of other public sector organizations.	DFAM (with support from DRP, FRG, PD and PPD)	June 2016	Underway	Concept Note under preparation.	
2. Assess the feasibility of changing UNICEF's approach to budgeting practices to an approach more supportive of results-based management.	DFAM (with support from DRP, FRG, PD and PPD)	December 2016	Underway	Concept Note under preparation.	
3. Develop and roll out a budget formulation tool that reinforces and supports results-based	DFAM	31 December 2017	Underway	Concept Note under preparation.	

budgeting, complementing UNICEF's various other RBM related initiatives (e.g. the introduction of a Programme Component Strategy Note and RBM capacity enhancement initiatives).					
--	--	--	--	--	--

