

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: November, 2020

## OCHA Evaluation of Country-Based Pooled Funds Global Synthesis Report

| REPORT RATING SUMMARY   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Overall Rating</b>   |  | <b>84%</b>   | <b>Satisfactory</b>  |
| ●●●●●   | Exceptional (96% - 100%)   | 5  |  |
| ●●●●●   | Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)   | 4  |  |
| ●●●●●   | Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)  | 3  | Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence  |
| ●●●●●   | Fair (35% - 62.49%)  | 2  |  |
| ●●●●●   | Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)   | 1  |  |
| REPORT DETAILS  |  |  |  |
| <b>Title of the evaluation report</b>   |  | OCHA Evaluation of Country-Based Pooled Funds Global Synthesis Report                                |  |
| <b>Report sequence number</b>   |  | Evaluation Office/65/2019/16622  |  |
| <b>Region</b>   |  | HQ   |  |
| <b>Year of report</b>   |  | 2019   |  |
| <b>Office</b>   |  | Evaluation Office  |  |
| <b>Coverage (countries)</b>   |  | Somalia, South Sudan, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Iraq, Afghanistan, DRC, Ethiopia, Yemen, Syria |  |
| <b>ToRs present</b>   |  | Yes  |  |
| <b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>   |  | May 26, 2021   |  |
| <b>Name of review firm</b>  |  | DefitEdge  |  |
| CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT   |  |  |  |
| <b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>  |  | Externally managed   |  |
| <b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>   |  |  |  |
|   | Every child survives and thrives   | Yes  |  |
|   | Every child learns   | No   |  |
|   | Every child is protected from violence and exploitation  | Yes  |  |
|   | Every child lives in a safe and clean environment  | Yes  |  |
|   | Every child has an equitable chance in life  | No   |  |
|   | Gender equality (cross-cutting)  | Yes  |  |
|   | Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)  | Yes  |  |
| <b>Evaluation object</b>  |  | Joint Programme  |  |
| <b>Evaluation type</b>  |  | Summative and formative  |  |
| <b>Evaluation strategy</b>  |  | Mixed methods  |  |
| <b>Evaluation design (primary method used)</b>  |  | Non-experimental   |  |
| <b>Evaluation level</b>   |  | Output & Outcome   |  |
| <b>Geographic scope</b>   |  | Multi-region/Global  |  |
| <b>Primary SDG(s) covered (number)</b>  |  | None specified   |  |
| <b>EQA Summary:</b>   |  |  |  |
| <p>The evaluation methods, data analysis, and findings are consistent with UNEG standards. The report is not rated as highly satisfactory in part because it is not a UNICEF evaluation and does not explicitly address several requirements of UNICEF evaluations such as ethical considerations, SDGs and the like. Otherwise, it is a very good evaluation of a complex problem in obtaining and managing funding for humanitarian actions. Its evaluation questions walk up the theory of change from inputs to outputs to outcomes and makes suggestions on how to manage this kind of funding more effectively.</p> |  |  |  |
| <b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b>   |  |  |  |
| <p>A reference to the rights-based context in which the funds are used, as well as some reference to the OECD/DAC criteria would have been helpful. Also placing the funding in the larger context of the SDGs might have given it a wider vision. In cases where information is provided in the annexes (including aspects on methodology), it should also be mentioned in the main body of the report.</p>  |  |  |  |
| SECTION RATINGS   |  |  |  |
| <b>SECTION A:</b>   | <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>   | <b>83%</b>   | <b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>   |
| <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 summary exceeds the preferred length. It is 6.5 pages, mostly because of the details in the recommendations.   |
| 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 necessary elements are included. The intended audience is clear.  |
| 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 programme intends to provide funding for humanitarian operations - this information can be found in the findings and recommendations but could be better highlighted in the introductory section. The evaluation process is described. |
| <b>SECTION B:</b>   | <b>BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>  | <b>64%</b>   | <b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>   |
| <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  | The glossary contains a good description of what the Funds do. The section on Evaluation context provides budget and timeline information.   |

|  |   |           |  |
|--|---|-----------|--|
|  | 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).  | Partially | This is found in Annex 11 but is not mentioned in the main text.   |
| <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.   | Partially | This is found in Annex 11 but is not mentioned in the main text. Data on expenditures is presented in the section on evaluation context.   |
|  | ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.   | No        | There is only one reference to the SDGs in a description of the Somalia case study, but it is not specific about which SDG.  |
|  | iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.  | Partially | The evaluation focuses on collection and distribution of funds rather than the beneficiaries.  |
| <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       | The mobilizers, managers and organizational recipients of funds are described.   |
|  | ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.   | Yes       | The key stakeholders are described, although UNICEF is only mentioned specifically twice as one of the partners.   |
| <b>SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b> |   | 100%      | Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)  |
| <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 is part of a sequence of syntheses that are expected to be presented, based on an analysis of individual country programmes.  |
| <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       | This is clearly stated - "The evaluation has two main purposes – to improve accountability and learning, and to examine the results of the humanitarian action supported by CBPFs with the purpose of drawing lessons on what has worked well. It also identifies challenges to their effective functioning in order to provide recommendations on how to continue to strengthen CBPFs as a funding mechanism in support of timely, coordinated and principled humanitarian response for affected people. It is anticipated that the evaluation will contribute to greater transparency and accountability for all stakeholders involved." |
|  | 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       | It is clear that this is a synthesis of evaluations of 18 CBPFs managed between 2015 and 2018.   |
| <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 main results are the provision and management of the pooled funds.   |
|  | 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       | Figure 2 shows the analytical framework between activities, outputs, outcomes and impact.  |
|  | 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.  | Not Rated | Not relevant to this evaluation.   |
| <b>SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>       |   | 70%       | Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)  |
| <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?<br><i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i> |           |  |
|  | i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.  | Yes       | The evaluation questions are structured according to the result area (impact, outcomes, output, activities and inputs). It does not use the OECD criteria since this is a funds-oriented evaluation.   |
|  | ii In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.  | Yes       | The evaluation matrix (Annex 3) contains information on indicators.  |

|                     |   |             |   |
|---------------------|---|-------------|---|
| <b>Question 9.</b>  | Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?   |             |   |
|                     | i Evaluation design and set of methods is relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.   | Yes         | Table 2 summarizes the methods well.  |
|                     | ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.  | Yes         | The data sources, the five country case studies, the extensive document review, over 683 interviews, visits to project sites and an on-line survey are appropriate.   |
|                     | 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 strategy is found in Annex 2. The basis for selecting country case studies is described in detail. How key interviews were selected is only partially described. There is less description of the strategy for selecting people to be targeted by the survey. |
|                     | iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.   | Yes         | There is a clear description of the methods of analysis in Annex 2.   |
|                     | v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.  | Yes         | The questions are structured to ensure analysis of the 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).   | Partially   | It is described in detail in Annex 12 but is not mentioned in the main text.  |
| <b>Question 10.</b> | Are ethical issues and considerations described?<br>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 obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability).  | No          | There is no reference to ethics or UNEG 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. | No          | There is a reference to confidentiality. The description is not at the UNICEF level of detail.  |
| <b>SECTION E:</b>   | <b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>   | <b>100%</b> | <b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>  |
| <b>Question 11.</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         | For each question, data are provided, organized by type of result.  |
|                     | ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.   | Yes         | The findings are structured according to results, which would be effectiveness if the OECD/DAC criteria were used.  |
| <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.   |             |   |
|                     | 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 a solid use of quantitative data on funds, and the use of case studies provides a qualitative context.   |
|                     | 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 findings are clearly supported by the evidence presented. This is particularly the case with the question on inputs.  |
|                     | iii 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         | Causal factors in managing the funds are carefully described, with examples provided.   |
| <b>Question 13.</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 if required in ToR) to support decision-making.  | Yes         | There is a major effort to examine how well the monitoring system works (some 47 references in the text).   |
| <b>SECTION F:</b>   | <b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>  | <b>100%</b> | <b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>  |
| <b>Question 14.</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         | There is a three page presentation of conclusions about effectiveness of the CBPFs  |
|                     | ii Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.  | Yes         | The conclusions flow from the findings and summarize them well.   |
| <b>Question 15.</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                       | Although there is not a specific lessons learned section, relevant lessons good practice examples and excerpts of case studies are highlighted in text throughout the findings.              |
|  | ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.   | Yes                       | They are well presented and at a sufficient level of detail.   |
| <b>SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>   |  | <b>75%</b>                | <b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>   |
| <b>Question 16. Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?</b>   |  |                           |  |
|  | i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.  | Yes                       | The recommendations are consistent with the evaluation purpose.  |
|  | ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.   | Yes                       | The recommendations are relevant for the OCHA fund managers, and operationalized.  |
|  | 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).  | No                        | The process is not described.  |
| <b>Question 17. Are recommendations clearly presented?</b>   |  |                           |  |
|  | i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.   | Yes                       | The recommendations are specific in terms of those responsible and priority level (critical and important). This is a good practice example for presenting recommendations.                  |
| <b>SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>  |  | <b>93%</b>                | <b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>   |
| <b>Question 18. Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?</b>   |  |                           |  |
|  | i Opening pages include:<br>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 structure is followed.   |
|  | ii Annexes include, if not in report body: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework, 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, results chain, information about the evaluator(s). | Yes                       | The annexes are complete.  |
| <b>Question 19. Is the report logically structured?</b>  |  |                           |  |
|  | i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).  | Yes                       | The report is very readable.   |
|  | 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 order is followed.   |
| <b>Question 20. Is the report well presented?</b>  |  |                           |  |
|  | i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.   | Yes                       | The synthesis report totals 70 pages.  |
|  | ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.  | Partially                 | While there are a few spelling errors, it is easy to read.   |
|  | 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 are many useful visual aids.   |
| <b>SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>   |  | <b>67%</b>                | <b>Comments on Rating (include explanations for any criterion not rated)</b>   |
| <b>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?</b> |  |                           |  |
|  | 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                        | There is no reference to rights-based issues.  |
|  | ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).  | Partially                 | There was no reference group but considerable interviewing of stakeholders.  |
|  | 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                 | Although rights-based terminology is not used, the language is otherwise appropriate.  |
|  | iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.  | Yes                       | There is reference to marginalize groups, and issues of disability are considered.   |
| <b>Question 22. Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards)</b>   |  |                           |  |
|  | 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 | Gender was incorporated into the analysis, although was not explicitly mentioned in the scope or objectives. Evaluation questions specifically refer to gender, inclusion and vulnerability. |

|     |  |                  |  |
|-----|--|------------------|--|
| ii  | A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. | Fully integrated | It is noted that the team applied a gender sensitive approach and how this was done was briefly explained. The gender of those interviewed was noted, as was the use of the IASC Gender Marker and the Gender with Age Marker (GAM) to examine gender mainstreaming. |
| iii | The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.            | Fully integrated | Gender was the subject of case studies highlighted and was well reflected in the findings, in several conclusions and in one recommendation.   |

**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?