

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: February, 2020

## United Nations Maternal and Child Stunting Reduction Programme in Three Target Districts in Sindh, Pakistan

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		92%	Highly Satisfactory
●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 100%)	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 (34.76% - 62.49%)	2	
●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.75%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	United Nations Maternal and Child Stunting Reduction Programme in Three Target Districts in Sindh, Pakistan		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Pakistan/64/2019/16426		
<b>Region</b>	SAR		
<b>Year of report</b>	2019		
<b>Office</b>	Pakistan		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Pakistan		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	September 20, 2020		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	AIMS		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)</b>	Jointly managed with Country		
<b>Unicef goal areas</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>	Joint Programme		
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative		
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Mixed methods		
<b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>	Theory-based		
<b>Evaluation level</b>	Output & Outcome		
<b>Geographic scope</b>	National		
<b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>	2 and 6		
<b>EQA Summary:</b>	<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>Overall, the report is extremely well written and the authors have taken great care to make sure that it captures almost all the necessary information required in the Geros guidelines. The report is structured in clear manner and the authors also do an excellent job of presenting information in a way that is most effective, e.g. using tables rather than prose to convey programme related information. This was especially well done in the findings section where the evaluators highlighted key findings in a succinct table at the top of every sub-section. The report displays few weaknesses, none of which detract from its overall quality. First, the authors could have provided a little bit more detailed information on the intended beneficiaries when describing the object of the evaluation (such as providing statistics of beneficiaries at baseline, although parts of this are covered in the findings section), even though they do describe the context of the intervention in detail. Second, the researchers might have paid a little bit more attention to the quantitative data used, which was obtained from a survey conducted by another consultant. Little information is provided regarding the survey or the sampling methodology, and it would have been good to comment on the "statistical legitimacy" of the dataset. Finally, an area of improvement might be to make the recommendations more specific and implementable, as they are currently a little too high level and do not include actionable details.</p>			
<p><b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b> <i>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.</i></p>			
<p>The report is an excellent evaluation and there are very few serious shortcomings. The only major area for improvement is in the recommendations section where each recommendation might be considered too broad and difficult to implement. The authors might do well to be more specific on how the interventions could be operationalized for the relevant parties. Additionally, the report uses some innovative graphics in parts of the report. While this makes for nice reading, it also takes the reader a little bit of time to understand the information conveyed; simpler graphics might have been better.</p>			
SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>		83%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
<b>Question 1.</b>	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	83%	
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 executive summary fits the 5-page limit. However, the spacing is single spaced and narrow margins are used, meaning that the formatting of the report allows for the executive summary to meet the criteria but at the same time reducing readability since it is text heavy.
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.	Yes	Yes the executive summary captures all the necessary elements.
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	Yes, the executive summary is well crafted and includes all necessary information without delving into details that are not included in the rest of the report.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		92%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
<b>Question 2.</b>	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?	100%	
i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	Yes, programme activities are very well described and presented in a clear table and a map. All programme related information - including timelines, location, cost and implementation status - are covered.
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/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	The authors include detailed descriptions of the intended beneficiaries of the program, by broadly discussing the types of groups that would benefit from the intervention (e.g. adolescent girls, infants and young children). Additionally, the authors provide background information on various "trends" in Pakistan across different themes (infections, poverty, geographic disparity etc.). This is helpful to put the project in context.
<b>Question 3.</b>	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?	75%	

	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	Yes, the institutional context is well described, both in terms of its relevance to broader trends in addressing malnutrition globally and in Pakistan (in particular, Government of Sindh).
	ii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention.	Partially	Yes, this is covered in the section describing programme beneficiaries. A description of the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries is included. This section could have been strengthened with more detailed baseline statistics on each of these beneficiary groups across each of the outcome indicators.
<b>Question 4.</b>		<b>Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?</b>	<b>100%</b>	
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders.	Yes	Yes, this is done very well with a clear description of national, provision and district level stakeholders. Additionally, the authors include community level stakeholders.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	Yes, the contribution of various government stakeholders and multilaterals in the development and implementation of the programme is included in detail. The role of UNICEF is captured with regards to its involvement and engagements with national level stakeholders. While UNICEF's engagement is recognized, its role in funding certain programs is not highlighted.
<b>SECTION C:</b>		<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>
<b>Question 5.</b>		<b>Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>	<b>75%</b>	
	i	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve.	Yes	Excellent. Very well described.
	ii	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation.	Partially	Yes, again, very clearly highlighted, with the intended users being GoP, UNICEF, ROSA and various donors, NGOs etc. Only drawback is that the team doesn't specifically identify each of the NGO stakeholders or individual multilateral donors.
<b>Question 6.</b>		<b>Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</b>	<b>100%</b>	
	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	Yes, this is covered in the report and well articulated. Each of the objectives are included as bullet points and these reflect the objectives outlined in 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	Yes, this is covered in detail in the main report as well as in Annex 5. All aspects were covered and no deviations were made from the ToR based on what is included in the report
<b>Question 7.</b>		<b>Is the results chain or logic well articulated?</b>	<b>100%</b>	
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to the evaluation.	Yes	Yes, the authors offer a brief description of the results chain explaining the programs overall objective (outcome) and intermediate outputs (outputs).
	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.).	Yes	Yes, the authors present a theory of change (in graphical form and in prose form) as part of the evaluation.
<b>SECTION D:</b>		<b>EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>
<b>Question 8.</b>		<b>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.</b>	<b>100%</b>	
	i	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation.	Yes	The evaluation uses the OECD-DAC framework and follows the evaluation questions outlined in the ToR. Cross cutting topics such as gender, social differences and HRBA, equity and DDRs are also included as part of the evaluation methodology. A detailed evaluation matrix is included in Annex 2A.
<b>Question 9.</b>		<b>Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?</b>	<b>88%</b>	
	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	All the necessary data collection methods are explained in detail, including desk reviews, qualitative analyses and quantitative analyses. As per the ToR, the team also conducted analysis of existing health related datasets. The report also details the methods used as part of the cost-benefit analysis.
	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.	Partially	Each of the data collection methods includes a source of the data. Information on existing data sources used for desk research is included; additionally information used for the cost effectiveness analysis is included. Although this criteria is met, one area where the report could have been further strengthened is where the evaluators discuss the cross-sectional data used for quantitative analysis (i.e. data gathered by another consultant); not much detail is provided on the sampling methods and it is unclear whether this was undertaken at the household level. The evaluators however do an excellent job of indicating how qualitative sampling took place, including details such as the gender breakdown of FGDs and KI participants.
	iii	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant).	Yes	The evaluators followed a clear evaluation matrix included in the annex that highlights how multiple sources and types of data were used as evidence. The evaluation matrix indicates that multiple sources and types of data were used to evaluate each research question.
	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	Evaluation limitations are very clearly articulated in a table, with appropriate mitigation plans. The activity is undertaken in a clear and systematic manner with the table proving an especially effective medium with which to convey the information.
<b>Question 10.</b>		<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:</b>	<b>100%</b>	
	i	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability).	Yes	Yes the report makes explicit reference to UNEG standards of independent judgement, impartiality, honesty, etc. The report states that the evaluators were cognizant of and committed to adhering to relevant guidelines.

	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.	Yes	The evaluation provides a detailed account of the ethical standards of UNEG (section C4). The report further indicates that special attention was paid to upholding principles and ethics for children under the age of 18 years.
<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>			100%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
<b>Question 11.</b>		Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	100%	
	i	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria.	Yes	Overall, the report very clearly builds off all the various data collected to produce findings. The report does an especially good job of using multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative data in the "Effectiveness" section. In other sections, one primary source of data was used to address the key research questions, mostly due to the nature of the questions that are being asked.
	ii	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	Yes, the report draws on the interventions results framework when evaluating whether each outcome was achieved or not. For each section of the Evaluation criteria, evaluation questions were answered based on indicators drawn multiple sources of data. A detailed matrix is included in the annex.
<b>Question 12.</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.	100%	
	i	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	Yes	Yes, this was very well articulated and especially well conveyed in the "Effectiveness" section where the evaluators used quantitative data to measure baseline status, endline status and evaluate whether the program achieved its intended outcome across various outputs and outcomes. The analysis is statistically rigorous and very clearly described.
	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.	Yes	Positive and negative aspects are presented for each of the evaluation criteria. In addition, one entire evaluation question is geared towards understanding unintended consequences and negative effects of the program.
	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	Yes, the report very closely follows the established logical chain, indicating how certain outputs result in intended outcomes and where activities could be improved. Impact related measures are beyond the scope of the study.
<b>Question 13.</b>		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	Yes, the report makes references to the interventions monitoring system in a number of different areas including (i) evaluating the program against global standards for using evidence-base and evidence-led data to tackle malnutrition, (ii) the collection of gender disaggregated information in line with HRBA guidelines, and (iii) program adequacy to carry out results-based management.
	ii	Assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making.	Yes	Yes, this is carried out as part of a specific section of the report. The evaluation found that the intervention monitoring system and analysis served as a tool for taking informed and timely decisions.
<b>SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>			75%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
<b>Question 14.</b>		Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	100%	
	i	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	Yes, the authors are extremely clear in highlighting where program interventions were positive and where they could be strengthened. Nothing was included that was not previously included in the findings.
	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).	Yes	The report discusses how the program has already put in place adequate measures to ensure results beyond the project lifespan in the conclusion section.
	iii	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings.	Yes	Each of the conclusions is substantiated with data from the findings. This was well integrated.
<b>Question 15.</b>		Are logical and informative lessons learned identified?	0%	
	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.	No	While the lessons stem logically from the findings, the evaluators do not elaborate how they might be applied in different contexts. Additionally, the authors do not explicitly highlight evidential limitations as part of the conclusions/ lessons learned section.
<b>SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>			90%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
<b>Question 16.</b>		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?	83%	
	i	Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations are logically derived from the findings. Additionally, recommendations follow from themes highlighted in "Lessons learned" section.
	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	Recommendations have intended users assigned to them, but could be strengthened by being more specific and actionable. At the moment, the recommendations are broad and it is unclear whether any can be put into practice by the intended users.
	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.	Yes	Yes, the authors indicate that recommendations were made after brainstorming findings with key stakeholders and receiving feedback on possible recommendations. Additionally, authors highlight that recommendations received endorsement from UNICEF (including senior management) and programme management from four offices.
<b>Question 17.</b>		Are recommendations clearly presented?	100%	
	i	Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations).	Yes	Yes, each recommendation comes with an intended user and audience.
	ii	Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	Yes, findings have a level of priority attached to them in addition to the "level" of intervention they involve (i.e. strategic vs operational)
<b>SECTION H: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>			80%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
<b>Question 18.</b>		Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?	100%	

	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	Yes, all of this information is included.
	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).	Yes	All of this information is included in the annex.
<b>Question 19.</b>	<b>Is the report logically structured?</b>	75%	
	i The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles).	Partially	Yes, the report section is well structured. However, the findings section can be a little difficult to follow as the evaluators didn't identify findings based on the evaluation questions.
	ii Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The overall structure of the report is logical and follows best practices.
<b>Question 20.</b>	<b>Is the report well presented?</b>	50%	
	i Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	Yes, the report is well presented. One drawback is that the entire evaluation is single spaced and margins are narrow, making it text dense and somewhat difficult to read. There are very few grammatical or spelling errors.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	100%	Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)
<b>Question 21.</b>	<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?</b>	100%	
	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.	Yes	Frameworks referenced include UNEG Norms and Standards, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, and UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation.
	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).	Yes	The involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation is clear. The participants make it a point to highlight who the stakeholders were and when their input was sought.
	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	Yes, the authors include human-rights language as well as gender-sensitive language. Given that some of the quantitative analysis pertains to activities specific to women, providing gender disaggregated statistics is not relevant. The authors were generally cognizant of socially vulnerable or marginalized groups and included findings and impact on these groups whenever relevant.
<b>Question 22.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity &amp; child rights?</b>	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	Yes, these assessments form a core pillar of the report and are explicitly stated throughout. Additionally, mainstreaming HRBA principles is a core evaluation question and, more generally, cross-cutting criteria in the evaluation included gender, social differences, equity, DRR and stakeholder participation.
	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	The study methodology suggests that there is a level of proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation. It does not appear that any group was deliberately excluded from evaluation.
<b>Question 23.</b>	<b>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards)</b>	100%	
	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	Yes, the evaluation is designed specifically to obtain GEEW related data. Specific evaluation questions (ToR section 2.3.5.6) are designed to evaluate GEEW data.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	This component is well integrated in the report with the authors specifically mentioning the use of male and female enumerators, and the gender composition of FGDs and KIs. Additionally, all analysis was disaggregated by gender.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The authors include findings on the programmatic elements in terms of their impacts on different genders. Additionally, the authors include "gender sensitive and responsive" approaches as part of their key findings and recommendations.
<b>SWAP Rating Guidance</b>			
	i <b>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.</b> 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 <b>A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</b> 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 <b>The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</b> 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?		