

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Endline evaluation of the Differentiated Service Delivery (DSD) Models of Care for Adolescents and Young People living with HIV (AYPLHIV) in Botswana 2018-2023

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		90%	Highly Satisfactory
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. 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>	Endline evaluation of the Differentiated Service Delivery (DSD) Models of Care for Adolescents and Young People living with HIV (AYPLHIV) in Botswana 2018-2023
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Botswana/63/2023/15392
<b>Region</b>	ESAR
<b>Year of report</b>	2023
<b>Office</b>	Botswana
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Botswana
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	February 7, 2024
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC

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	Yes
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)	Yes
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>	The report makes reference to SDG3, ideally the report could have made reference to SDGs, 1,

**EQA Summary:** *The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.*

This is a highly satisfactory report which offers a list of relevant and inter-connected conclusions, findings and recommendations, which will help inform programmatic decisions moving forward. Its areas of strength are:

1. It is clear why there was a need to undertake this evaluation, the findings will be useful to the Botswana Ministry of Health, UNICEF and other supporting partners and funders.
2. Reference has been given to the SDGs, more specifically SDG3.
3. The evaluation questions are appropriate.
4. The intended results are clear, these are noted in a retrospective ToC.
5. The methodology allows for causal connections between the outputs and expected outcomes.
6. Reference has been made to UNEG guidelines.
7. The team have clearly given a lot of thought to research that relates to children, ensuring that children were comfortable by having youth researchers facilitate in FDG.
8. The conclusions, findings and recommendations sections are all connected. The findings present both the strengths and limitations of the intervention, this is important as it will facilitate forward learning for future projects of this nature.
9. It is gender inclusive.

Negatives:

1. The report is slightly too long, therefore it needed to be edited. This includes the executive summary which is 12 pages long.
2. Minimal engagement with the SDGs.
3. There are numerous sections in the report that could be added to the annex section. For an example see section 3.
4. There are sections of the report where there is a degree of repetition.
5. Though the structure of the report is very similar to standard UNICEF reports there are some issues with structure.

**Recommendations for Improvement:** *The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.*

- Recommendations for improvements:
1. Before the report was submitted, it would have helped if the report had been edited, proofed and formatted, a final copy edit was needed.
  2. The report is over the proposed page length, therefore the report either needed to be edited or the sections that are in the main body of the report that could be moved to the annex section should be moved to the annex section. This will enhance the report and ensure that the report flows better and is more logical.
  3. Greater attention provided to the SDGs.

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 Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	The executive summary is very informative, it will be useful for informing future decisions relating to supporting young people living with HIV in Botswana. It is written for the intended users of this report. Though a very informative executive summary, as an executive summary it is too long, it is currently 12 pages.
ii Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	The executive summary includes all of the necessary elements that are noted in this criteria.
iii Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Yes	The executive summary includes all of the information that is needed to understand the intervention and the purpose of the evaluation, new information is not presented within the executive 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 Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	A clear and relevant description of the intervention is provided, this includes the locations, timeline, budget and implementation status.
ii Clear and relevant description of intended rights holders (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).	Partially	A clear and relevant description of the intended rights holder and duty bearers has been included in the report. Geographical locations are noted, and some disaggregation data has been included. The report would have benefitted from including some data that related to youths with disabilities as well as make reference to other intersectional factors.
<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.	Yes	A clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention has been included, this covers relevant policy, socio economic, political and institutional/internal factors. The context section relates to the intervention, it is clear why there was a need for this project and support from UNICEF.
ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	The report makes reference to SDG 3, this is a welcome inclusion. Given the objectives of the project, the report could have made reference to SDGs 5, 1 and 2.
iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rights holders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	A very clear and relevant description of the status and needs of the beneficiaries is included, this section is excellent.
<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).	Partially	Table 2 provides an overview of what key partners did, this is a helpful table. What is missing is more information relating to the organisations who delivered some of the frontline services, for example the teen clubs, here it would have helped if all stakeholders were identified including local CSOs. The report would have benefitted from having a stakeholder map.
ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The contributions of the stakeholders, be this financial or the roles that they played are noted in tables 1 and 2.
<b>SECTION C: 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 purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, it is clear why the evaluation was undertaken when it was. It is also clear what its intended use is and who the intended users are.
<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 report includes a clear and complete description of what the evaluation sought to achieve by the end of the evaluation process, the objectives have remained unchanged.

	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	A clear and relevant description of the scope of the report has been included, the evaluation covered all 6 project sites and where possible mirrored the baseline design (please refer to page 22). The evaluation timeline is noted, with this being January 2018-July 2023.
<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?</b>		
	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	A clear description of the interventions intended results has been presented, specifically the report notes that the intended results of the project were to ascertain if a multi-pronged intervention package improved clinical, psychological and behavioural outcomes for young people living with HIV. For more information please refer to section 4.2.
	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	Though the theory of change (ToC) and the supporting ToC narrative does not mention outputs and outcomes, it is clear that outputs and outcomes have been considered when designing the ToC.
	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 project did not have a ToC, therefore the team were tasked with designing a retrospective ToC, this was supported by the evaluation reference group.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 8.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation?</b> <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 and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation, they are aligned to 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.	Yes	A comprehensive evaluation matrix is included in the annex section, in addition of the over arching evaluation questions and sub- questions the evaluation matrix also includes the following: indicators, methods and sources.
<b>Question 9.</b>	<b>Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</b>		
	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.	Yes	The evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and are adequately robust for the evaluations purpose, objectives and scope. The methods are clearly described as too is the design, specifically this is a longitudinal two point reflective evaluation that employed mixed methods.
	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, be these secondary/primary, qualitative/quantitative were appropriate for this evaluation, clear descriptions are included in the report.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The sampling strategies employed were purposeful and snowballing, these are described within the report. Diverse perspectives were captured. What's missing however is a justification for the sample size for the qualitative data.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	A clear and complete description of the methods of analysis has been included, though complete the section relating to cost effectiveness analyse is too long, this section needed to be edited and if needed added to the annex section.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for drawing causal connections between the outputs and expected outcomes this is due to the methods that were employed.
	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	A clear and complete description of the limitations that the team encountered as well as how they addressed these is noted. Where possible they tried to bridge the gaps in primary data.
<b>Question 10.</b>	<b>Are ethical issues and considerations described?</b> 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 ethics section of the report is very detailed and covers UNEG obligations as well as many others. Key principles are also discussed.
	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	A comprehensive description of the ethical safeguards for participants is noted, importantly given the focus of the evaluation (namely the involvement of children) explicit reference has been made to UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research involving children.
<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	During the FGD that were held with children, the team enlisted the support of youth researchers to ensure that the children were more comfortable, this is an excellent practice. It is highly likely that this will have had a positive impact on the children who were involved in the FGD.
<b>SECTION E:</b>		<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>100%</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 findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions. The findings are aligned to the OECD DAC. A small observation however: it would have helped if the evaluation questions were presented against the findings. For example under <i>Relevance</i> , the following evaluation question could have been added- <i>To what extent were the care and support needs of the AYPLHIV adequately met through the package of interventions?</i> Having this information means that reader does not need to look in the annex section.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The ToC has been used in the formation of the retrospective ToC. An example of this can be seen on page 36.
<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	Multiple sources of data have been used, be this qualitative/quantitative, primary/secondary, therefore the team have been able to ensure triangulation. The findings also present output and outcome level data.
	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	A baseline study was undertaken therefore the evaluation team were able to make comparisons. The findings (which are very detailed) are clearly supported by, and respond to the evidence that has been presented. The findings highlight both the positives as well as negatives.
	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 causal factors leading to the achievement or non-achievement of results have been noted. As noted the ToC has been analysed.
<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.	Yes	Section 6.3.3- 'Project monitoring and evaluation', provides a comprehensive overview of the limitations of the projects M&E processes, of which there were none, this is an evident design limitation.
<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 conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. The findings will be helpful if this project is to be rolled out on a national level.

	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 are derived appropriately from the findings, they present both the strengths and limitations of the intervention.
<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	The lessons stem logically from the findings, they have the potential to be of relevance beyond the object of this evaluation.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are clearly and concisely presented, sufficient detail has been provided so that they are useful to the intended users of this report.
<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	The recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, they are clearly formulated and are logically derived from the findings and conclusions. The recommendations table is very informative.
	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 useful and have the potential to be actionable for the primary users if funding is available.
	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).	Partially	Some reference has been made as to how the recommendations were developed (please see page 70). It is not however clear how rights holders and duty-bearers were involved.
<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.	Yes	The recommendations have been classified. The duty bearers responsible for each action are noted.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>57%</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 contain all of the information that one would expect to see in the opening pages of a UNICEF report.
	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.	Yes	The annex section of the report is very comprehensive and adds to the standard of the report.
<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).	Partially	The report is easy to navigate, titles are clear as too are sub-titles, this noted the report needs to be formatted.
	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.	Partially	The structure of the report is mainly in accordance with UNICEF guidelines. The report would have benefitted by having the ToC in the methodology section, chapter 3 of the report could also have been included as an annex, or importantly this information incorporated into the findings section. Section 4.4 could also have been added as an annex, as too could section 4.5. The report would have benefitted from having the evaluation questions in the methodology section and section 5.1.3, though interesting is not needed in the main body of 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.	No	The ToR notes that the report should be within 40-60 pages, this report is 72 pages long.

	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The report is easy to understand and is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors. This noted a final copy edit is needed, (please see page 29 for an example "In summary the data collection tools and techniques used for quantitative data collection are presented in Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.".) The report also needs to be formatted and would also benefit from being less text heavy.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Partially	The visual aids that are included within the report convey key information However, some of the visual aids are not labelled, for an example please see page 5.
<b>SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>		64%	Comments on Rating
<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.	Partially	Some reference has been made to rights based frameworks, this is a welcome inclusion, what is needed is more attention to CEDAW.
	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).	Partially	A reference group was set up, it is not however clear who was in this group. Youth researchers were involved in elements of the primary data collection.
	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 and terminology used within the report is inclusive. The data, where possible has been disaggregated. However due to issues of recruitment there was minimal opportunity to disaggregate the data by vulnerabilities. To note, people living with HIV are often perceived to be vulnerable due to levels of stigma that people living with HIV can/do encounter.
	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	Childs rights are at the heart of the evaluation, this is due to the focus of the intervention. Where possibly the evaluation was disability inclusive.
<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)	6	
	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 evaluation has dedicated questions that relate to GEEW. Human rights including those of children are also noted.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	Data was disaggregated by sex. The evaluation took ethics very seriously and ensured that they were inclusive.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The findings section reflect a gender analysis, as too do the conclusions, the limitation is with recommendations with only recommendation 4 being slightly connected to gender.

#### 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?
- Are 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?