

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Summative Evaluation of The Right To Have Rights Project (2014-2018)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	88%	Highly Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence
●●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Summative Evaluation of The Right To Have Rights Project (2014-2018)		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Republic of Mozambique/63/2021/13533		
<b>Region</b>	ESAR		
<b>Year of report</b>	2021		
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Mozambique Country Office		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Mozambique		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	February 12, 2022		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	DeftEdge		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	UNICEF managed		
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>			
Every child survives and thrives	No		
Every child learns	No		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	No		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	No		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	No		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Project		
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative		
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods		
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based		
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Output & Outcome		
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National		
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	3		
<b>EQA Summary:</b>	<p>This is a highly satisfactory summative evaluation of the Right to Have Rights Project (RtHR) in Mozambique, however it is limited by the absence of annexes. The Executive Summary is concise and can inform decision-making. The Purpose, Objectives, and Scope of the evaluation are clearly described, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users. The evaluation uses theory-based evaluation design to answer the evaluation questions. Notable examples of good practice include the use of Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) for administering the surveys. The Findings are data-driven and clearly address all the evaluation objectives. The conclusions are sufficiently forward looking and add insights beyond findings and analysis. The evaluation fully incorporates UNEG's ethical considerations and principles in conducting an evaluation, however issues of gender and disability could be more clearly addressed.</p>		
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>	<p>Although this is a strong and well-written report, there are a few ways in which it could more closely align with UNICEF standards. These include (i) having a more concise Executive Summary to help ensure this section is read in full by the intended audiences; (ii) providing a detailed description and a standalone section on the context and how it relates to the implementation of the intervention; (iii) providing a detailed description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors); (iv) providing an assessment of the adequacy of the monitoring and evaluation system; (v) prioritizing the recommendations; (vi) being more specific about how the methodology was gender responsive, including by having a gender disaggregated list of evaluation participants, and (ix) ensuring the gender-related shortcomings identified in findings and expressed in conclusions are fully addressed in the recommendations. The most significant limitation is the absence of annexes.</p>		
SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>	83%	Comments on Rating	
<b>Question 1.</b>	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
i	Partially	The Executive Summary is comprehensive and serves as a standalone document, but at 6 pages, it could be more concise particularly in presenting the context and description of the intervention.	
ii	Yes	All of the necessary elements are included per UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports.	
iii	Yes	The Executive Summary is well drafted and provides the reader with enough information to fully understand the evaluation and intervention. No information that is not in the report is included in the summary.	
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>	79%	Comments on Rating	
<b>Question 2.</b>	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Yes	The authors provided a succinct summary of the intervention in Section 1.2 including locations and timelines, as well as cost/budget in Paragraph 10. The background includes a discussion on the needs and rights of children to birth registration, followed by an overview of the intervention and its implementation status.	

	ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability... (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	Duty bearers are mentioned in the introduction with more details provided later in the report.
<b>Question 3.</b>		Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Partially	There is a very short overview of the context in Paragraph 5, but the report lacks detail about the context and how it relates to the implementation of the intervention.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	The authors mentioned SDGs in the Background section, but they could have indicated what the relevant goals and the targets are.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The Background section discusses the needs for birth registration without providing any details about the status and needs of rightsholders.
<b>Question 4.</b>		Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	The report states that RTHR was implemented by a tripartite Private-Public Partnership between GoM and Lurio Green Resources (LGR) facilitated by UNICEF and with Sida as the main donor.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The roles of the government institutions (Ministries of Justice and Interior), LGR, and UNICEF were briefly mentioned.
<b>SECTION C:</b>		<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 5.</b>		Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The evaluation purpose and intended use are described in Paragraph 18, Section 2.1. Intended users are provided in Section 2.4.
<b>Question 6.</b>		Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	The authors presented the three objectives of the evaluation in Section 2.2.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	The geographic and temporal scope of the evaluation are provided in Section 2.3.
<b>Question 7.</b>		Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?		
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	Two programme objectives are provided and the results achieved are presented in Paragraph 9.
	ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	Yes	The authors provided a reconstructed ToC in Section 1.3 with a brief narrative of the pathways of change and assumptions.
	iii	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Yes	The reconstructed ToC is provided and the authors provided an independent assessment of the quality of the ToC in Section 4.7.
<b>SECTION D:</b>		<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	86%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 8.</b>		Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions summarized in Table 5 in Section 2.5 are aligned with the intended purpose and objectives of the evaluation and are premised on the OECD/DAC criteria.
	ii	In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	No	The authors noted that the key evaluation questions, sub-questions, indicators, data sources and proposed data collection methods are provided in Annex 2. However, there are no annexes to this report.
<b>Question 9.</b>		Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i	Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Partially	The authors indicated in Section 3.1 that they used theory-based and Human-Rights and Gender approaches to the evaluation per the requirements in the ToR. However, both approaches are not fully described.
	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The data sources are appropriate as summarized in Table 1. Overall, the evaluators conducted 21 interviews and a sample of 136 people surveyed.

	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The evaluators used snowball (or chain-referral sampling) and they provided the rationale and detailed description in Section 3.4 (including the limitations). Participants nominated other potential participants for the evaluators to include in the study.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Section 3.5 provides a brief description of the data analysis approach. It is indicated that the authors used descriptive and interpretative qualitative methods based on identified patterns and frequency of themes in the primary data. Quantitative data from the survey was analysed to get basic descriptive statistics with frequency distributions.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for causal connections to be through the re-constructed theory of change.
	vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	Section 3.8 provides a detailed description of seven limitations and constraints faced by the evaluators and measures they used to overcome them.
<b>Question 10.</b>		Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	The authors provide a specific and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators in Section 3.7.
	ii	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	Section 3.7 explains how evaluators adhered to the ethical considerations and the principles of consent, confidentiality, independence, impartiality, and respect for human rights.
<b>Question 11.</b>		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Yes	A notable example of good practice is the use of Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) for administering the surveys via phone interviews and native interviewers.
<b>SECTION E:</b>		<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 12.</b>		Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	The evaluation findings are organized by the key evaluation questions and sub-questions for each evaluation criteria. The authors presented the main evaluation questions at the start of each criterion and they provided <u>evaluative evidence to substantiate the finding.</u>
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The evaluators appeared to use the results framework as a basis for interpreting data, despite its absence in the annexes.
<b>Question 13.</b>		Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence?		
	i	Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation findings are evidently data-driven. The evaluation uses several direct quotes from qualitative sources in the form of in-text citations and text-boxes, and the quantitative data from survey is presented in tables and figures.
	ii	Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	The evaluation findings are well-balanced, showing both the positive or negative unintended outcomes or when the expected outcome could not be measured.
	iii	Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The findings are shown against complex contextual factors in which (and with which) the programme works. These are presented as mediating and moderating factors used to explain the achievement or non-achievement of the intended changes.
<b>Question 14.</b>		Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i	Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Partially	The authors provided a full assessment of the adequacy (or inadequacy) of the ToC, but not the monitoring and evaluation system as would generally be expected.
<b>SECTION F:</b>		<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 15.</b>		Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i	Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	The evaluators drew six conclusions from the key findings. These conclusions are broad and aligned to the evaluation purpose and objectives.

	ii	Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	The conclusions highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the project and provide insights and analysis beyond the findings.
<b>Question 16.</b>		Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i	Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	Yes	There are six broad generalizable lessons learned organised by the evaluation criteria. The lessons learned are logically derived from the findings and holistically demonstrate the larger picture and understanding of the broader context in Madagascar. Lessons are well formulated with the <b>topic of each highlighted in boldface sentences.</b>
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are concisely presented with sufficient detail to be useful for the intended audience.
<b>SECTION G:</b>		<b>RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 17.</b>		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i	Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	There are eight recommendations, two are targeting UNICEF, three targeting UNICEF and the Government of Mozambique, one targeting the implementing partner, while another targets SIDA. The recommendations <b>are clearly derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions.</b>
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are clear and actionable, and guidance for implementation for each set of is provided.
	iii	Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	Yes	The authors received feedback from key stakeholders in a workshop conducted with the ERG. There is a description of stakeholder involvement in the methodology section of the report.
<b>Question 18.</b>		Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i	Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partially	The duty-bearers responsible for implementing each recommendation are provided, but the authors do not provide a clear prioritization of the recommendations.
<b>SECTION H:</b>		<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 19.</b>		Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages include the required material.
	ii	Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	No	The annexes are listed and would be complete but they are not provided.
<b>Question 20.</b>		Is the report logically structured?		
	i	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report is well designed with a clear delineation of sections and sub-sections.
	ii	Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The usual structure is respected. The context, scope, objective and methodology of the evaluation are clearly presented. All other required sections are included in the report.
<b>Question 21.</b>		Is the report well presented?		
	i	Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	At 61 pages, including the executive summary, the report is of reasonable length.
	ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The evaluation is well-written although there are a few editing errors.
	iii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report uses tables, figures, textboxes, and photos. These are all well-labeled and convey appropriate information.
<b>SECTION I:</b>		<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 22.</b>		Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	The evaluators explicitly referred to CEDAW, CRC, and the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
	ii	Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	It is noted that the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) provided guidance and comments to the inception report, the draft evaluation report, and recommendations.
	iii	Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	The language is consistent with standards. For example, the evaluation used language such as equitable child rights, inclusion of marginalized populations, and gender rights and equity, parents or children with disabilities. The report provided data disaggregated by age and gender for some key findings.

	iv	Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Partially	The report is explicit about addressing child rights, particularly the inclusion of parents and children with disabilities in the programme. However, despite inclusion of the concerns of the persons with disabilities in the ethical considerations in the evaluation methodology, the analysis makes minimal reference to PWD and data disaggregated by disabilities is not provided.
<b>Question 23.</b>		Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	5	
	i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The description of the evaluation scope notes that the incorporation of equity, gender equality and human rights in the programme design will be addressed. GEEW is considered under the criteria of Relevance and in at least 1 evaluation question.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	Despite general reference to inclusivity of marginalized groups and adhering to principles of gender equity, there is minimal discussion of gender considerations including in the sampling and analysis processes, and the report does not provide a gender disaggregated list of evaluation participants.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The background, findings and conclusions reflect gender considerations, but the recommendations about human rights, gender, and children lack depth.

#### SWAP Rating Guidance

**i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.**

- Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?
- Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
- Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
- Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?

**ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.**

- Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?
- Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

**iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.**

- Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?
- Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?
- Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?