

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of UNICEF's Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Programme in Namibia

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		83%	Satisfactory
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●○●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports. Decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report	Evaluation of UNICEF's Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Programme in Namibia		
Report sequence number	Namibia-63-2022-16054		
Region	ESAR		
Year of report	2022		
Office	UNICEF Namibia Country Office		
Coverage (countries)	Namibia		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	February 9, 2023		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	UNICEF managed		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	Yes		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
Evaluation object	Programme		
Evaluation type	Summative and formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Participatory		
Evaluation level	Impact		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	6		
EQA Summary:	<i>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.</i>		
<p>This evaluation is strong in many aspects, such as providing an extensive background, context and thorough stakeholder identification. The purpose, objectives and users are fully identified, and the methodology very strong. Ethics and human rights are fully considered and GEEW is a recurring theme. The findings offer in-depth analysis and use of mixed methods. The effective use of illustrative graphics, figures and other visual aids is considered innovative for presenting evaluation results. The report is well structured and clearly written. The evaluation falls short in presenting strong conclusions, lessons and recommendations and these shortfalls are also evident in the executive summary where conclusions and lessons are missing. The recommendations have not been fully vetted with stakeholders and therefore are tentative. They need prioritization and a more detailed description of responsible parties and actions to be taken. The impact discussion is not clear on why the indicators for stunting are not available since this is a high level result area for this WASH programme.</p>			
<p>Recommendations for Improvement: <i>The rater will identify top line 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.</i></p>			
<p>The top priority recommendations are as follows and should be based on the guidance offered in the UNEG and UNICEF guidelines or others found in reputable sources online.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The conclusions (Chapter 5) should be revised to present overarching high level analysis above and beyond the background and findings and not repeat them in detail, developing the conclusions to launch the recommendations and it would be easiest to tie them to the criteria and/or number them so they can be matched with the recommendations; 2) The recommendations (Chapter 5) should be prioritized and vetted with stakeholders and should clearly launch from conclusions, and mention the relevant conclusions to tie them together; 3) the recommendations require a stronger structure to note the steps to be taken to implement them and the responsible parties; 4) the lessons should be re-written to offer a generic statement, possibly examples from the evaluation and offer advice as to how to help other offices and countries to avoid the same issues; 5) revise the Executive Summary based on these revisions and strengthen the background by presenting the goals of the object as per the Theory of Change and preferably using the criteria as headers for the conclusions; and, 6) The findings section on Impact needs to clarify why the data for stunting and the teams analysis of the connections was not possible as this is a gap in realizing the Theory of Change and may indicate lack of coordination with the health sector which would require a recommendation but an explanation is warranted. 			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	50%	Comments on Rating
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
	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 summary is clearly written, however, it is only three pages and does not contain conclusions or lessons, therefore it is not complete for decision makers. It would be more clearly presented using the criteria as section headers and using more pages if needed.

	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.	Partially	The purpose, objectives and intended audience are covered. The methodology should mention the criteria followed. The conclusions and lessons learned are not included and key recommendations are not suitably developed in terms of prioritization and launching off of the conclusions.
	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.	Partially	The key goals of the intervention should be mentioned such as to eliminate or reduce open defecation, improved health and reduced stunting, following the Theory of Change. It is significant in this evaluation that the data needed to tie WASH to reduced stunting is not available and that should be brought out clearly. No new information is introduced.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			100%	Comments on Rating
Question 2. 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	Table 1 provides the locations, timelines, cost and implementation status with accompanying narrative.
	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	Section 1.4 covers the stakeholders' roles and interests. They are described using terminology of duty bearers and rights holders.
Question 3. 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	Section 1.1 covers the country and local context. Section 1.3 covers the Object of the Evaluation effectively including the partners, the coverage of interventions, the rationale of the targeting, stakeholders, and financial resources disbursed and expenditures.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Section 1.2.1 covers the SDG 6, target 6.2, and related indicators. The SDG target for USAID, the donor is discussed in various sections and SDGs are brought into the findings.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	Sections 1.3 and 1.4 cover the status and needs of rights holders and builds on the substantial information provided in the country and local context.
Question 4. 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	Table 2 presents an analysis of stakeholders, roles and interests, categorized by primary and secondary duty bearers, national regional and local committees, civil society and private sector, international development partners and rights holders.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	Table 2 indicates the roles and contributions of each of the stakeholders.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			100%	Comments on Rating
Question 5. 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	Chapter 2 clearly defines the purpose which is forward looking and comes after five years of the WASH programme implementation in order to document outcomes and promote learning. The uses and users are clearly depicted on Table 4.
Question 6. 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 nine objectives are clearly described. Although lengthy, the original objectives from the TOR were kept by the evaluation team and incorporated into the evaluation questions. To be noted in the findings, the Objective 4 on nutrition outcomes and reduction of stunting lacked data to prove the connection and should have been removed or made more reasonable while the questions were reviewed.
	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	Section 2.3 describes the scope and notes that the scope originally in the TOR was adjusted due to delays in the evaluation. The focus was shifted from 2014-2019 to 2016-2020 while still considering proceedings from 2014-2016. Table 5 mentions the 5 regions and projects visited out of the nine that were covered.
Question 7. 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	Section 1.6 presents the Theory of Change in graphic form in Figure 4 with an accompanying narrative description.
	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 graphic and narrative present the Theory of Change and note the progression from activities, outputs, outcomes to anticipated impact which includes reduced stunting.

	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 Theory of Change was assessed and was not reformulated by the evaluators. The evaluators assessed the assumptions and risks including COVID 19 influencing the Theory of Change in Table 6.
SECTION D:		EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	95%	Comments on Rating
Question 8.		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	Section 3.1 presents the evaluation framework which is set out on the evaluation matrix in Annex 2. The relevant criteria, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability with cross cutting gender and human rights are aligned with the questions and sub-questions.
	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	The evaluation matrix contains indicators and the assumptions have been constructed as per the Theory of Change.
Question 9.		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.	Yes	The methods are adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose and are fully described. Mainly, document review, key informant and focus group interviews and field observations were used.
	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 and clearly described. Tools were developed to collect data and are found in the Annexes.
	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 sampling strategy appears in section 3.3. It is mainly purposive but the target areas were randomly selected. Both on-line and face to face interviews were conducted and they are shown on Table 7 and the locations on Table 8. In addition the gender balance of the stakeholders reached is found in Figure 5.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Section 3.5 describes the data analysis process. The evaluation matrix was used to structure all the raw data and it was further disaggregated along gender, disability, location, poverty, ethnicity and other characteristics. Trends and conflicting data were analysed.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The Theory of Change was tested through the analysis as to the causal connections between outputs and outcomes.
	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).	Partially	Section 3.6 covers the discussion of the limitations but does not consistently mention how the evaluation mitigated them. The lack of documentation is mentioned in different aspects but how the team dealt with this limitation is unclear. Suggest creating a matrix with two columns, the limitation and the mitigation measures, such as triangulation. COVID-19 is not specifically discussed as a limitation but should be.
Question 10.		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	Section 3.7 covers Ethics and Quality Assurance. The obligations are referred to both UNEG and Ethical guidelines as well as national guidelines.
	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	The description of safeguards is included such as obtaining permissions and avoidance of harm. Children were not specifically interviewed. An Evaluation Reference Group reviewed all of the ethical procedures.
Question 11.		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 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	Typical forms of data gathering and analysis were used and COVID-19 was a limiting factor. However, the team has very effectively used innovation in presenting illustrative and often technical graphics and figures to add depth to the findings. For example, Figure 8 shows standard specifications for toilet construction while Figure 13 depicts the Snapshot of the GIS Sanitation Dashboard used by Development Workshop Namibia, a partner. The findings contain a number of photos, quotes and charts or tables that contribute greatly to the understanding of the WASH situation and how it is managed in Namibia.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	92%	Comments on Rating
Question 12.	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 section is well organized and systematically addresses the evaluation questions and sub questions. The impact questions are not directly answered particularly the relationship with stunting and improved nutrition. Lack of data is one reason given and this needed to be explored further as to why the prevalence of stunting could not be mentioned as data is likely to be collected on this indicator for the SDGs among others, as well as indicators of nutrition status that are likely to be routinely collected, which suggests weak coordination with the health sector and/or that the evaluation did not look into these aspects thoroughly. It is suggested that under Impact Section 4.4 further explanation is needed as to why the connections have not been further explored since this is a connection that is important for judging how well the WASH inputs are working.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	The assumptions and risks that the team has outlined against the Theory of Change (ToC) are tested in the findings but the direct references are not found. It would be good to add sentences that indicate where the ToC and the risks are being evaluated to tie the program design and outputs/outcomes all together. It is noted that the Executive Summary more effectively brings in the ToC.
Question 13.	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 uses both qualitative and quantitative data and identifies where there are data gaps. Table 11 documents delivery of outputs against targets.
	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	Both positive and negative findings are supported by evidence and based on standards and benchmarks as well as indicators. The findings contain a great deal of what can be considered background information and unclear if these are new findings from secondary sources.
	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 are thoroughly examined and the findings section identifies key achievements against the targets in Table 11. Table 12 presents the higher level outcomes in numbers of communities declared open defecation free. The overall result and impact aimed for the complete open defecation free however is affected by lack of political will to allocate more resources to the effort. This was a main area of focus in the Theory of Change.
Question 14.	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	The evaluation assesses the results based management system that UNICEF uses and notes that gaps exist in agreements with partners regarding monitoring indicators and gender equity and human rights based monitoring. Progress toward SDG 6 joint monitoring of water and sanitation is discussed.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	63%	Comments on Rating
Question 15.	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).	Partially	The conclusions are forward looking but unclear whether they reflect the objectives of the evaluation. They are also very heavy with findings and background added in. Suggest mentioning the objectives of the evaluation to remind the readers and ensure that they are being addressed at the beginning of the conclusion section, Chapter 5, currently not mentioned in conclusions or recommendations. Suggest to tighten each conclusion to allow them to effectively lead into the recommendations using statements that identify challenges to be addressed through the recommendations.

	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.	Partially	The conclusion section contains a great deal of background and repeats of the findings. The conclusions are more of a summary with too many details rather than a set of tightly developed higher level analyses. They should be formulated to supply insight beyond the findings and avoid re-presenting evidence and have sufficient clout to lead into the recommendations.
Question 16.		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 nine lessons Section 5.2 and stem from findings and with some adjustments in wording and offering advice can be made more applicable to other situations.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The nine lessons vary in their presentation and of them Lesson 9 is the most well developed (as per using guidance for lessons learned) with generically stating the lesson learned, and some of the needs that must be met to implement the lesson but still falls short of offering some of the workable solutions to other countries. For Lesson 8, there is no lesson but rather a finding. For example for Lesson 2, what should be done to ensure adequate staff capacity and budgetary allocation to work toward the SDG6? The lesson may be better formulated to say that the CLTS makes gains but they are not substantial enough to change the results leading toward SDG 6 without adequate staff and budget and then explaining what can work to address the challenges.
SECTION G:		RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	50%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.		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.	Partially	The recommendations section 6 is not finalized as per the introduction and they still need to be vetted with the major stakeholders. There is still findings and evidence presented and unclear how the recommendations are launched off the conclusions.
	ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	The recommendations are likely to be useful and actionable but the guidance for their implementation is not presented and it seems they have not been approved by UNICEF thus are still tentative.
	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	Partially	The process seems to be to vet the recommendations with the duty bearers but the rights holders are not mentioned. Reasons for the delay in getting validation are not mentioned.
Question 18.		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 recommendations mention some responsibility but require a great deal of clarification such as prioritization and charting for clarity.
SECTION H:		REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.		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	These elements are all included.
	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 annexes contain the required elements.
Question 20.		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 structure is easy to navigate with numbered sections, and clearly formatted. Please hyperlink the page numbers to the Table of Contents, and present the evaluation matrix Annex 2 in landscape form or in compacted upright form for easier reading as it is a critical component and hard to read sideways.
	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 UNICEF guidelines have been followed.
Question 21.		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	The TOR does not specify a certain number of pages, but the report is of reasonable lengths.
	ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is generally very well written with some grammatical errors that could be easily fixed.

	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.	Yes	The use of visual aids is excellent and clearly presented and labelled.
SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)			100%	Comments on Rating
Question 22. 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 evaluation is focused on rights based frameworks of UNICEF and government and UN stakeholders, among others. The UNICEF Gender Action Plan is mentioned and GEWE.
	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	An evaluation reference group was established and active and the level of participation of stakeholders explained.
	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 empowering and inclusive and the terminology of duty bearers and rights holders used throughout. Data is disaggregated where possible and gender balance in participation analysed.
	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.	Yes	Child rights are addressed and Leave no one behind is referred to as well as persons with disabilities and questions as to their inclusion were part of the interview process
Question 23. Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)				
	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.	Fully integrated	GEEW is integrated into the program and the evaluation and the criteria questions and analysis examine the degree to which GEEW is considered. A cross cutting section is devoted to gender equity and human rights.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The methodology and tools incorporate gender.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	These sections all address GEEW.

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?