

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: February, 2020

Terminal evaluation: Catalytic Support to Peace building in Sri Lanka (Outcome # 4 - UN catalytic engagement with resettlement and durable solutions has supported wider political transition, peace-building and reconciliation efforts in Sri Lanka)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		64%	Satisfactory
● ● ● ● ●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 100%)	4	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
● ● ● ● -	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
● ● ● - -	Fair (34.76% - 62.49%)	2	
● - - - -	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.75%)	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
Title of the evaluation report	Terminal evaluation: Catalytic Support to Peace building in Sri Lanka (Outcome # 4 - UN catalytic engagement with resettlement and durable solutions has supported wider political transition, peace-building and reconciliation efforts in Sri Lanka)
Report sequence number	Sri Lanka/64/2019/16333
Region	ROSA
Year of report	2019
Office	UNICEF Sri Lanka
Coverage (countries)	Sri Lanka
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	October 15, 2020
Name of review firm	AIMS

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)	Jointly managed with one or more UN agencies
Unicef Goal Areas	
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	No
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	No
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
Evaluation object	Project
Evaluation type	Summative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome
Geographic Scope	National
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	SDG 16

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.*

The report starts with a clear Executive Summary that, as a stand alone piece, can inform decision-making. The report is well written but there are some issues with the structure, presentation and completeness of the document. Data sources, the rationale for their selection and sampling strategy as well as data limitations are clearly described. The evaluators seem to have ended up with extensive, sufficiently diverse, and an overall strong set of data. Conclusions flow from findings, and recommendations from findings and conclusions. Yet, several critical elements are missing. These include evaluation questions (or an explanation of why they were left out), an evaluation matrix, results framework and/or ToC, reference to data analysis and triangulation, and consistent reference to data sources in describing findings. Results are mostly presented against what the evaluators call results areas. Since no results chain is fully presented, it is difficult to say if these results areas fully cover the scope of what was to be covered by the study. The evaluators do not mention if the result areas are referred to in the project document or other, or if they have been reconstructed by the evaluators. All this means that there is a missing link, overall in the report, between the evaluation framework and the findings, and as a result evidencing the findings throughout is difficult. The same applies to GEEW; although there was good adherence to ethical principles and issues of gender and equity were satisfactorily integrated in the evaluation, there could have been more clarity about how gender was assessed and the respective data sources.

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

The report presents a very decent set of data, and a plausible set of findings, conclusions and recommendations. However, there is very limited inclusion of data sources in presenting the findings and no basis for the analysis is presented. The report would benefit from presenting the evaluation questions, an evaluation matrix (or a presentation of any judgement criteria with indicators to show causal relationships and expected results), a results framework and/or ToC, reference to data analysis and triangulation, references to data sources in describing findings, and the interview protocols (annexed). It is also suggested that the usual structure for an evaluation report be followed (with Findings presented by evaluation criteria and a separate section for all Conclusions). In this case, having the section on Performance at the end of the Findings did not really add value, particularly as it contained a mix of findings and conclusions. Under Efficiency, it would be good practice to present an analysis related to the budget and cost (even only the delivery rate, overall and by implementing partner). While the report presents recommendations that are grounded in the findings, they could be more actionable by identifying the actor(s) responsible for their implementation and by being presented in priority order. To better reach the evaluation standards outlined by UNICEF/GEROS, it is good practice for the evaluation manager to explicitly mention the GEROS requirements in the evaluation terms of reference to help ensure that they are included in the evaluation report (i.e. information on ethics, analytical conclusions, actionable recommendations, etc.). Ongoing dialogue between the evaluation manager and the evaluation team throughout the evaluation is also a good way to communicate GEROS standards to evaluators. As for better incorporating gender considerations, useful resources include the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations (2014). Further guidance on strengthening evaluation processes and reports can be found in the GEROS Handbook and in the UNICEF Adapted Reporting Standards (2017).

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	67%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	67%	
	i An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users (Maximum of approximately 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	The ES is well structured and reader-friendly, although at 6 pages, it is somewhat longer than the preferred length.
	ii Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Partially	All of the elements were included, although the intended audience of the evaluation is not explicitly mentioned.
	iii Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report.	Yes	This is adequate. The ES gives a brief picture of the intervention and goes into more depth about the evaluation.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	75%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 2.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	75%	
	i Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Partially	All other aspects but the cost/budget of the object of the evaluation are clearly described in the section providing the background. Cost information is important for the reader to understand the scope of the intervention. A map would be useful for locating the project sites.
	ii Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cites, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	Intended beneficiaries (families) are clearly described, including their locations (settlements in Telippalai and Kopay DS Divisions in Jaffna and in Muttur DS Division in Trincomalee) and total number (11,449) targeted.
Question 3.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	100%	
	i Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (relevant policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	Context of the intervention and how its relevant aspects relate to the implementation is clearly described, including the contextual differences in the two provinces where the project has been implemented.
	ii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention.	Yes	Status and needs of the Sri Lankan IDPs in general and those resettling in the 2 provinces covered by the project are described with clarity.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	50%	
	i Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders.	Partially	There is a listing of the many country-level implementing partners. It would be helpful if they were organized by sector or type. Development partners, including the European Union as the funding partner, are not mentioned.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	For the implementing partners (UNDP, UN-Habitat, UNICEF) this is done in the report and for the others in the Annex 2.1 – Project Implementation Responsibilities/Technical contributions. It would be helpful if the Annex was referenced in the main report. Missing again is the EU and information related to financial contributions.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	67%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	50%	

	i	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve.	Partially	The evaluation objectives state the use of the evaluation but the use/what to achieve with the use is not explicitly described.
	ii	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation.	Partially	The evaluation objectives refer to "all right holders and duty bearers" and these are listed. Again, the intended primary users are not explicitly described.
Question 6.		Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	100%	
	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 evaluation purpose and objectives are clearly stated. It is noted where there are deviations from the TOR.
	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 evaluation scope and focus are clearly stated and follow the TOR.
Question 7.		Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	50%	
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to the evaluation.	Partially	Scope of the evaluation, as per the TOR, covers one outcome of a programme, and the outcome and its outputs are clearly described. However, the evaluation framework looks at what they call results areas. Since no results chain is fully presented, it is difficult to say if these results areas fully cover it. The evaluators do not mention if the result areas are referred to in the project document or if they have been reconstructed by the evaluators.
	ii	The causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (theory of change, logic model, results chain, evaluation matrix, etc.).	Partially	The outcome and outputs are identified in the narrative but there is nothing that shows the chain of expected results nor any judgement criteria with indicators helping to appreciate the causal relations evidenced. The report refers to and discusses the intervention's ToC but the ToC is not presented anywhere in the report or its annexes.
SECTION D:		EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	50%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 8.		Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	0%	
	i	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation.	No	The evaluation approach is described and the evaluation makes use of the OECD/DAC criteria (in line with the TOR) but the evaluation questions are not presented. There is only one reference to them in the report: "The data collection methods and tools were customized to obtain answers to the evaluation questions stipulated in the Terms of Reference under the given criteria." The TOR attached to the report is in a summary form and excludes the evaluation questions (they are available for the EQA in a separate, broader TOR document).
Question 9.		Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	75%	
	i	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope.	Yes	The evaluation design focused on 8 specified key interventions implemented under one of the project outcomes. The design appears appropriate and includes an extensive set of interviews, FGDs and field visits, along with a survey and some document review.
	ii	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated.	Yes	Data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy are well described and include bringing in diverse perspectives. Data limitations and their impact on the coverage of the evaluation are clearly described.

	iii Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant).	No	There is no description of the methods of analysis and no reference to triangulation. In the description of the findings and results, only minimal reference is made to the numerous, relevant (primary) sources of data described in the report and, thus, it is not possible to assess if triangulation has been used.
	iv 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	Limitations and constraints are well described and their impact on the evaluability and evaluation of the intervention is made clear. There is not much in terms of mitigation but the limitations seem such that the evaluators could not have done much to mitigate them.
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:	25%	
	i Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability).	Partially	While only independence is explicitly referred to, the language used to describe overall evaluation principles proposes understanding of all.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (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.	No	Evaluators' adherence to ethical safeguards is well described. However, no reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children or to any other frameworks governing the safeguards.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	79%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 11.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	75%	
	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria.	Partially	Evaluation criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, as well as the cross-cutting themes, are addressed. Impact was left out because of the well described relevant limitations; as described above, the evaluation did not appear to make systematic use of the evaluation questions and they are not presented in the report.
	ii Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	Findings are described in reference to the outcome and outputs within the scope of this assignment.
Question 12.	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.	67%	
	i The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	Partially	Findings seem very well justified; there is logic and coherence in their description. They seem evidenced. However, as the report does not contain an evaluation matrix and there is no reference to data analysis used, for some findings the link between the extensive sources of data and the findings could be better articulated.
	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.	Partially	Findings are balanced and where the sourcing of the data is presented/referred to, the evidence seems fully supportive of them. Again, because of the reasons mentioned in EQA Q12 i, and since there is limited use of indicators referred to in the report, the degree of support could be more clear.
	iii The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The report is strong in identifying and analyzing the effect of the contextual factors.
Question 13.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	100%	
	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).	Yes	The report makes a succinct but comprehensive analysis of the intervention's monitoring system.
	ii Assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making.	Yes	Evaluators make a short assessment of the use of monitoring data; findings include that "follow-up actions on the M&E findings are not reported" and that a better system would enable the opportunity for remedial action and more synergy in the outcomes. These findings are carried through to the recommendations.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	75%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)

Question 14.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	67%	
	i Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	The Conclusion section is very brief. The focus is a rating ('Highly Satisfactory' to 'Less than Satisfactory') and score given by the evaluators for each of four criteria used. A brief explanation of each is given which shows the overall strengths and weakness of the project. There are also conclusions written into the Findings (particularly section 5 on performance), Lessons Learned and Recommendations that, if placed under Conclusions, would have made this section more robust.
	ii Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Partially	The evaluation was to be final but because of delays in implementation, the project was still underway at the time of the evaluation. There are some elements of the conclusions that address the rest of the project, particularly concerning Sustainability but these could be more fully explained. The introduction to the conclusion notes that there are demonstrated successes useful for the "Government as blueprints for action in similar contexts" but the section is overly general.
	iii The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings.	Yes	Conclusions flow from the findings.
Question 15.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified?	100%	
	i Identified lessons that stem logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	Yes	Lessons stem logically from the findings and mostly appear useful for guiding the design of similar initiatives (i.e. the timing of the psycho-social care).
SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		50%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 16.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	50%	
	i Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	Recommendations stem logically from the findings and conclusions.
	ii Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation).	Partially	There is an extensive set of seemingly useful recommendations covering all aspects of the program.
	iii Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation.	No	There is no description on the process. The TOR refer to a reference group and in total two validation meetings with stakeholders but they are not mentioned in the report.
Question 17.	Are recommendations clearly presented?	50%	
	i Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations).	Partially	Target group (agency or other entity) has been identified for a very small number of recommendations.
	ii Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partially	There is a clear, thematic classification of the recommendations. However they are numerous (over 30) and should be prioritized to support use.
SECTION H: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		50%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 18.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	25%	
	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.	No	Much of this information is missing from the opening pages and some from the entire report (incl. Annexes). Annexes are not listed in the table of contents. The table of contents appears to have not been updated as it does not reflect the final page numbering.
	ii Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, 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, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s).	Partially	Much interesting information has been annexed, notably observations from field visits and concerning the educational sector, and findings from the Telephone Survey to assess Youth Enterprise Development Component. Yet, key items are not there (and neither in the body of the report): Evaluation Matrix is missing, and so are all interview protocols.
Question 19.	Is the report logically structured?	75%	
	i The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles).	Yes	There are clear titles and sub-titles, both numbered.
	ii Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Partially	The report mostly follows the usual sequencing but there is an additional section after Findings, Project Performance, which briefly covers the DAC criteria - it is partially about findings and partially about conclusions.
Question 20.	Is the report well presented?	50%	

	i 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 well written. However, there are several editing errors.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	65%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
Question 21.	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?	50%	
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	No	No reference is made to these frameworks.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Partially	Participation of key stakeholders as informants is described. No mention of a reference group or validation meetings is made although the TOR mentions both.
	iii Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations which can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.	Yes	Such stylistic evidence is plenty: collecting data disaggregated by sex, examining the extent to which elements of gender responsive programming have been incorporated into the design, and assessing efforts at gender mainstreaming, are all mentioned in describing the evaluation principles.
Question 22.	Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?	100%	
	i Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention (such as the involvement in the intervention of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children).	Yes	Gender and social equity are seen in the intervention and in the evaluation as cross-cutting, and the evaluation assesses the intervention for gender-related issues, and to a lesser extent for the overall social equity considerations.
	ii Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the ToRs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.).	Yes	Based on the lists of FGDs, KIIs, field visits, observation, and telephone surveys, there is proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation (as informants).
Question 23.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards)	56%	
	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.	Partially integrated	Gender is not mentioned in the overall objectives and evaluation questions are not provided to understand how gender was assessed. However, GEEW is highlighted as a main consideration under Evaluation Principles so was clearly a key part of the intended scope of the study.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluators make a general statement that the evaluation design was gender responsive; mixed methods were used, gender disaggregated data was presented, data analysis incorporated gender dimensions.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	Social equity and gender are taken up in several places in the Findings and gender-related issues are touched on under Recommendations. However, the missing elements (evaluation questions, evaluation matrix, reference to data analysis and triangulation, references to data in findings) mean that evidencing GEEW throughout is difficult.
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. a. 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? b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?		

	<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>a. 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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
	<p>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>a. 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?</p> <p>b. 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?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. 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?</p>