

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Independent Evaluation of the Effectiveness & Impact of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 3-Healthy Lives) in Nigeria

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>	91%	Highly Satisfactory	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence
●●●●-	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●- -	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●- - - -	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Independent Evaluation of the Effectiveness & Impact of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 3-Healthy Lives) in Nigeria
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Nigeria/61/2021/16339
<b>Region</b>	WCAR
<b>Year of report</b>	2021
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Country Office Nigeria
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Nigeria
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	February 5, 2022
<b>Name of review firm</b>	DeftEdge

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	Country-led (government) evaluation
<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	No
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Strategy
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative and formative
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Quasi-experimental
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Impact
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	3

**EQA Summary:**  
 This is a thorough evaluation that looks at how well one of the Sustainable Development Goals (3 on health) has been implemented and what could be done to improve the likelihood that these can be obtained by 2030. The focus is on the National Strategic Health Development Plan (NSHDP II). The evaluation uses an innovative quasi-experimental design to obtain process information at the state level by stratifying the states in terms of evident results based on national statistics. Most of the data come from implementation statistics and national reports, but causal data is obtained through a thorough and innovative set of 60 case studies of health facilities in the selected states. The conclusions are thorough and the 31 recommendations are practical. Although the report provides a good analysis of the current system and useful recommendations for decision makers, it is very lengthy at over 200 pages.

**Recommendations for Improvement:**  
 There are several ways this report could more closely align with UNICEF evaluation standards. (i) The Executive Summary and the whole report should be more concise to increase accessibility and the likelihood that they will be read in full by the range of intended users; (ii) The number of respondents for each type of data collection method should be specified, and broken down by stakeholder group and gender; (iii) A more concise set of Conclusions would also be helpful especially given the length of the findings; (iv) In accordance with inclusive evaluation practices, disability inclusiveness should be assessed, rights based terminology should be used, the methodology section should be clear about how the evaluation process was gender responsive; and (v) Reference should be made to UNEG ethical principles for evaluators.

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 serves as a stand alone document that is useful for decision makers. However, at 7 pages, it is longer than the preferred length, in part because it includes several detailed footnotes.
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	All of the intended elements are present.
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 summary is complete and does not add information.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>	100%	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	Because this is an evaluation of everything the government does to implement SDG 3 on health, especially targets 3.1 and 3.2, there is a description of all of the programmes involved, with funding shown in detail in findings under efficiency.

	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	The rights-holders are all of the citizens of Nigeria, although the focus is on vulnerable populations, women and children. The duty bearers are those who provide health care, at federal, state and local levels.
<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	There is a clear and extensive presentation of the current state of health in Nigeria, as well as of the policies related to the SDGs.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	This is an evaluation of SDG 3.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The statistics presented show clearly the status and needs of the rightsholders, particularly in terms of targets 3.1 and 3.2.
<b>Question 4.</b>		Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	Implementing organizations at all levels are shown, with a focus on six states that are compared to determine causal factors. Figure 3 shows the structure of Nigeria's health system.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The roles are clear for national duty bearers, and the contributions of UNICEF and other UN organizations are discussed in findings.
<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 evaluation was intended to help Nigeria present results of its efforts to achieve SDG 3, and improve implementation.
<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 six objectives are stated, and include determining ToC outcomes and drawing lessons for other countries in the region.
	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 scope is defined in terms of the evaluation criteria (what each will look at) and thematic programmatic areas. Timeframe is specified in the evaluation purpose. Although the geographic focus is national, the evaluation looks more in-depth at states which were determined in the ToR.
<b>Question 7.</b>		Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?		
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	The results chain is clear in the SDG strategy, which shows the expected services to be provided to achieve the targets.
	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 relationships are carefully described and are presented in the ToC diagram in Figure 4 and in Figure 5 which shows the NSHDP mission, strategic pillars and priority areas.
	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	This is done; the focus of the assessment is the extent to which the theory behind the national plan to implement SDG 3 is realistic.
<b>SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>			86%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 8.</b>		Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i	Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The 21 questions are organized under ten criteria, six of which are the OECD/DAC criteria including coherence and an additional four that cover what were considered also important: human rights/'leave no one behind', gender equality, equity, and universality.
	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 matrix is described in the text and shown in detail in Annex 3, which includes indicators and sources of information/data for each question. Where benchmarks exist, they are shown in the analysis leading to findings.
<b>Question 9.</b>		Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		

	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	Evaluators describe a robust process using two approaches - realistic evaluation and systems thinking which involved five quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Methods included analysis of a range of health systems and financial data, assessment of health facilities, in-depth interviews, and a survey targeting officers in charge of health facilities. Comparative analysis is used to compare states with high, transitional and low effectiveness.
	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	This is a very broad scoped evaluation, so the main source of data is official statistics and data. Primary data comes from health system and health facility assessments conducted in the six target states - sources are a range of health systems staff. These appear appropriate and are all well-described.
	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 selection of the six states is carefully described. Purposive sampling was also applied for the selection of 60 health facilities (10 per state). This was based on (i) number of live births per year attended; (ii) caseload of major childhood diseases attended, including malaria, acute respiratory infections, and diarrheal diseases; and (iii) location of the health facility. The criteria for selecting key informants at the health facilities is also described. However, the numbers of respondents for each method are not provided in this section making it difficult to assess the extent and representativeness of the sample.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The methods of analysis include using statistical tools to ensure that data can be shown clearly. The evaluators used criteria for determining the strength of evidence ratings shown in Table 3.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	Use of correlation statistics, comparison of states and in-depth interviews provide for drawing causal connections.
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	Section 3.5 describes the limitations and the mitigation measures mostly having to do with absence of data at the local level and the effects of COVID-19.
<b>Question 10.</b>	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	No	There is no reference to the UNEG ethical standards.
	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	There was an ethical review of the methodology before data collection could begin and the evaluators clearly implemented the safeguards in their interviewing and observation, including especially anonymity.
<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	Evaluation of SDG targets is by definition complex. It involves using agreed indicators and then trying to determine what makes programmes work. An innovation of this evaluation is to use a quasi-experimental design at national level, by comparing programmes in six states where the differences are by geography and, more importantly, by performance according to the indicators. This is a potential model approach for wider use.
<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 are organized by criterion, question and in some cases by sub-question and in all cases there is enough empirical evidence to support the finding.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The results framework is used consistently.
<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	There is extensive use of both qualitative and quantitative data at both the output and outcome level. There is good use of respondent quotes to illustrate key findings. Triangulation is used throughout.
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	The evaluation uses strength of evidence criteria shown in Table 3 for each finding, based on the quality and quantity of evidence available in the relative performance indicators.
	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	Causal factors are clearly identified. There are sections dealing with management issues and the connection with results, including Chapter 5 on health policies implementation.

<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	There are assessments throughout on the adequacy of monitoring and evaluation, especially in questions on relevance, but also on effectiveness.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	<b>88%</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 grouped into four themes that were suggested as foci for the evaluation: (i) governance and accountability; (ii) health financing; (iii) revitalization of primary health care; and (iv) capacity strengthening. They draw on the findings organized by criterion and combine them to be more actionable in the future.
	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 conclusions clearly flow from the findings and are balanced. Among the most important are those areas where improvements are found to be necessary. However, this section is 11 pages long which reduces the extent to which the reader can easily get a clear overview of the evaluation results.
<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 learned are derived from the findings and conclusions and summarize what needs to be done in Nigeria and elsewhere when looking at SDG 3. Of particular interest is the lesson "No standardized metrics to assess progress and implementation of SDG3."
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	At three pages they are concise but have enough practical detail.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>100%</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 flow directly from the purpose, are clearly formatted and presented in Table 32, with links to conclusions shown. They are organized by thematic area.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	They are practical and specify what needs to be done to implement them.
	iii Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	Yes	The evaluation notes that "The recommendations from the evaluation have been discussed, revised, and finalized through participatory approaches in many successive meetings." These are described and involve most of the duty-bearers.
<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	Those responsible are noted in the main table and described in detail in Annex 13. Priority levels and timeframes are given.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 19.</b>	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages includes the required information.
	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 are complete as they include all the annexes referenced in 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 structure of the main report is easy to navigate. However, the annexes do not include page numbers and they are not linked from the table of contents, making them difficult to find.
	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 structure is in accordance with the guidelines.
<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 main report is 199 pages, significantly exceeding the standard length, although some of that is due to more space between paragraphs than would be necessary.
	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 very well-written.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There is frequent use of visual aids including 32 tables and 46 figures.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 22.</b>	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	There is a discussion on the Convention on the Rights of the Child and Nigeria's Children's Rights Act in the section on Universality.

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	A reference group was established, and their role is described. The groups of stakeholders participating as respondents are clear.
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).	Partially	While the language is empowering and the data are disaggregated as necessary, rights holder and duty bearer terminology is not used.
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	Child rights and leave no-one behind are two of the criteria used in the evaluation. Disability is not mentioned, however.
<b>Question 23.</b> Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)		5	
i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Satisfactorily integrated	Although not explicitly mentioned in purpose or scope, GEEW is a standalone criteria with the question - To what extent have the NSHDP and flagship programmes incorporated equality gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls into the design, implementation and monitoring of interventions?
ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	Although there was substantial collection and analysis of disaggregated data, there is no discussion on how the evaluation process itself was gender responsive. The explanation of ethical practices is quite minimal. The number of evaluation participants is not disaggregated by gender or stakeholder group.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	Findings include a thorough analysis of the extent to which gender and equity issues are considered in the NSHDP and flagship programmes. These issues are carried through to conclusions but are not apparent in recommendations.

**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?

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

- 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?
- b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- e. 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.**

- 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?
- 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?
- c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- 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?