

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Evaluation of the Government of Rwanda and UNICEF Country Programme of Cooperation (2018-2024)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY		
<b>Overall Rating</b>	55%	Fair
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4
●●●○●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2
●○○○○	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1
<b>REPORT DETAILS</b>		
<b>Title of the evaluation report</b>	Evaluation of the Government of Rwanda and UNICEF Country Programme of Cooperation (2018-2024)	
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Rwanda 63-2024-17894	
<b>Region</b>	ESAR	
<b>Year of report</b>	2024	
<b>Office</b>	Rwanda country office	
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Rwanda	
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes	
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	June 20, 2024	
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC	
<b>CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT</b>		
<b>Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)</b>	UNICEF managed	
<b>Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)</b>		
Every child survives and thrives	Yes	
Every child learns	Yes	
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes	
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes	
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes	
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes	
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Country Programme	
<b>Evaluation type</b>	Summative and formative	
<b>Evaluation strategy</b>	Qualitative	
<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>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10	
<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>The information presented in the report is comprehensive and it is clear that this has been a large evaluation that has managed to provide a lot of useful information. This is however not clearly presented in the report. The evaluation report's strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The evaluation design including methods is sound and clear.</li> <li>•Ethical principles are clearly presented and adhered to.</li> <li>•There is a clear and relevant description of the intervention's context, i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional and international factors are presented and also how the country programme relates to the context. This includes a clear and relevant description of the status and needs of the rightsholders of the intervention.</li> <li>•The evaluation's purpose and objectives are clearly presented and the evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation.</li> <li>•The conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation.</li> <li>•The recommendations align with the evaluation purpose. They are clearly formulated and derive logically from the evaluation findings and they are useful and actionable for the primary intended users and uses.</li> </ul> <p>The report contains some weaknesses, however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The report lacks a description of the intervention; there is no clear and separate presentation of the design of the country programme, its components, activities and target population. This is a significant shortcoming.</li> <li>•No linkages are drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the areas being evaluated. The SDGs are mentioned 20 times in the report, but only referred to in general; which SDGs these are referring to are never specified in the report, nor their relevant targets or indicators.</li> <li>•The intervention's theory of change is not actively used in the report, and the main findings are not clearly presented and highlighted. There is a lot of text presented in the findings section and main findings sometimes "disappear" in the text and are not highlighted or drawn into the summary sections.</li> <li>•The results reporting is unclear in that it reports on both programme activities and outputs as results and sometimes presents stakeholders' perceptions as evidence for achievement of results without presenting sufficient evidence to back up the claims.</li> <li>•Some of the findings presented are clearly supported by sound evidence, but this is not presented in a clear and systematic way in the report. The links between activities, outputs and outcomes are not presented in the findings section, and the evidence supporting the findings is often unclear in the report. This is also lacking in the evaluation matrix where only the evaluation questions and sources of information are presented.</li> <li>•The lessons are not clearly and concisely presented; they are a mix of findings and recommendations and are not formulated as lessons.</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations for Improvement:</b> <i>The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.</i>		

The following are recommendations for improvement:

The report would benefit from:

- including a clear and comprehensive description of the evaluand, i.e. the intervention that is being evaluated.

- editing the findings section to ensure that:

- oThe presentation of main findings is clear and systematic

- oToC is actively used to show the logical links between activities, outputs and outcomes

- oThe results reporting would be clearly based on triangulated evidence; i.e. stakeholders' perceptions of programme achievements would be backed up by evidence from other sources.

- The links between activities, outputs and outcomes would be clearly presented in the ToCs, the evaluation matrix and in the results reporting.

- clearly identifying which SDGs the Rwanda UNICEF country programme have contributed to, including specifying their relevant targets and indicators.

- The report would benefit from presenting the lessons in a clear and concise manner. The difference between Facts, Findings, Lessons and Recommendations have been defined by IEG (the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group) as follows and might be useful:

**The Difference Between Facts, Findings, Lessons, and Recommendations**

**Fact:** What happened—an event and data (results). Not in dispute.

*Example:* "The project manager was dismissed in year 5."

**Finding:** What the analyst interpreted or concluded from the facts specific to the project. Can be disputed. □

*Example:* "Mainly because replacement of the project manager was delayed, the project did not meet its targets."

**Lesson:** The broader significance of a finding. It draws a conclusion from experience that may be applicable beyond the project under review. □

*Example:* "Poor performance by project managers can critically affect project outcomes." Or:

"If skilled project managers are not in place, it may affect the project performance negatively".

**Recommendation:** Suggests how to proceed in the future in the light of this experience. Proposes actions. □

*Example:* "The borrower should ensure that key project management positions are filled with competent staff. The Bank should help ensure this through appropriate covenants and prompt supervision."

## SECTION RATINGS

SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		50%	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 is clearly presented and can serve as a standalone document useful for informing decision making. It is in general of relevant conciseness and depth for key users but it lacks a good description of the programme itself. It is of 5 pages.
ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Partially	It includes nearly all necessary elements; evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned and key recommendations, as per the ToR. But it lacks a good overview and presentation of the intervention itself.
iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Partially	The report does not include all significant information needed to understand the intervention, as it lacks a description of the evaluand (i.e. of the country programme). It does not introduce new information not presented in the main report.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		43%	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.	No	The report lacks a clear and relevant description of the intervention; there is no clear presentation of the full intervention in the report, nor in the annexes (i.e., no clear overall presentation of the programmes' components and activities and also no clear presentation of the budget and expenses neither separately or in line with the programme design/components/activities. The intervention's location, timeliness and implementation status are described.)
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/cites, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	It is stated that girl and boy children, youth and women are the intended rights holders of the programme, and that duty bearers include the Government of Rwanda and its ministries and departments, community actors and community-based structures and organizations. These are, however, not clearly identified by type, geographic location or in terms of numbers reached (nor are they disaggregated).
<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 relevant description of the intervention's context, i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional and international factors are presented and also how the country programme relates to the context.
ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	No linkages are drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the areas being evaluated. The SDGs are mentioned 20 times in the report, but only referred to in general (like e.g.,: "UNICEF's contribution to achieving the SDGs"). Which SDGs these are referring to are never specified in the report, nor their relevant targets or indicators.
iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the status and needs of the rightsholders of the intervention under "Key Development Issues in Rwanda", pp 2-6.
<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).	Partially	No clear stakeholder map is presented, and there is no clear presentation that provides an overview of the development partners, right holders and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders - nor of the linkages between them. UNICEF's Key National Government Partners are listed in a table on page 9. However, development partners (e.g. other bilateral donors and UN agencies), implementing agencies (local NGOs) and additional duty bearers (e.g. government institutions) are mentioned throughout the report. It is clear that there are numerous development partners and implementation agencies in this country programme, but the report does not present a clear overall picture of them and their relations to the country programme and/or to each other.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	No	There is no overall presentation of the specific contributions and roles of the key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.
<b>SECTION C:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<b>Question 5.</b>	<b>Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?</b>		
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Partially	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at this point in time, its intended use and the key intended users. The broad purpose of this evaluation is threefold : <input type="checkbox"/> Inform the design of the next UNICEF Country Programme Document; <input type="checkbox"/> Promote effective decision-making; and <input type="checkbox"/> Reinforce the accountability of UNICEF to key internal and external stakeholders, including the national government, international donors, and UNICEF Executive Board. The main intended users and uses are outlined in table 3.1 on page 11. The reasons why the evaluation was needed at this point in time is not clearly specified, but can be derived from the need to inform the design of the next UNICEF Country Programme Document.
<b>Question 6.</b>	<b>Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?</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	There is a clear description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve. The objectives of the evaluation are: 1) to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability, and orientation towards impact of the Rwanda CP 2018-2024 with a particular focus on the six key strategies, social behaviour change, gender, and disability inclusion; 2) To identify and document key lessons from the current CP to make the best use of UNICEF's change strategies, good practices, and innovations; and 3) To provide a set of forward-looking and actionable recommendations to strengthen programmatic strategies and introduce new interventions in the design of the next Rwanda CP, taking into consideration behaviour change, gender, disability inclusion as well as national development priorities and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the country.
	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).	Partially	The temporal, geographic, programmatic and organizational scope of the evaluation is presented in table 3.2 on pages 11-12. However, there is limited information of what will not be covered (apart from the statement that the evaluation "is not meant to be an assessment of the full results framework".) No reasons for the scope is presented and key terms are not defined.
<b>Question 7.</b>	<b>Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?</b>		
	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.	Partially	There is no clear description that provides a good general overview 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. The main body of the evaluation contains no clear description of the overall programme or of the programme's intended results. The country programmes results matrix is presented in the appendices, but it is not systematically used in the report when presenting the findings and reporting on results, and the results presented are often not compared to targets set in the results framework. The main report presents percentages of achievements (in section 5.3.1 in bullet points and in a table), but provides no related information of what was achieved or not, hence the information of percentages provides limited to no information of what the programme actually achieved. More concrete reporting from the results framework is done on an ad hoc basis under each of the outcome areas, making it difficult for the reader to grasp the bigger picture regarding results.
	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).	Partially	The causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in several ToRs in the appendices; one overall programme ToR and ToRs for each of the programme areas were reconstructed by the evaluation team. These are however of relatively poor quality, with vaguely identified inputs and outputs, with logical gaps and unclear links between outputs and intended outcomes. Furthermore, the ToRs are not used in the presentation of findings in the evaluation report. The country programme results matrix contains a mix of indicators to measure implementation performance (i.e. programme activities) and outputs and have limited to no relevant indicators to measure results at outcome level.

	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.	No	The programme's theory of change is not assessed in the evaluation. Theories of change were reconstructed by the evaluation team and are presented in appendices, but these are not used in any notable way in the evaluation of the programme.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>Comments on Rating</b>
<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 evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation questions are organized under each relevant evaluation criteria in the evaluation matrix in Annex 4.
	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.	No	The evaluation matrix does not include indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other process from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.
<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	The intended evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope, and they are well described in the report.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Partially	Data sources are somewhat unclear and inadequate. The programme's results framework is not used in a systematic or orderly way in the assessment of program achievement, making any comparison between targets and achievements challenging. The sources of the statistics presented are unclear, resulting in unclear reporting on programme achievements. It is, for example, unclear to what extent the results presented are general national achievements or results from the UNICEF country programme. With regards to qualitative data, some positive results are presented from interviews with stakeholders but without sufficient verifiable evidence to back up the claims. Key informant interviews and focus group discussions were held.
	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 sampling strategy is described in table 4.3 on page 14. It is stated that the sampling was purposeful and that stakeholders who were familiar with the country programme were chosen as interviewees. The names of selected districts are stated, but it is unclear why those districts were selected over others as the selection criteria are not provided. Geographic selection criteria are listed in annex XIV (page 61ff in the annexes), but only the three selected districts are presented so it is not possible to make an independent comparison of all districts to independently verify the appropriateness of the selection.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	The report contains a brief description of the methods of analysis, but it is relatively schematic and would greatly benefit from more detail. The coding framework, for example, is only mentioned and not outlined. The method of analysis is outlined in two short paragraphs only as follows: "The evaluation's analysis and synthesis took place in two phases: (1) individual case studies; and (2) overall synthesis of the findings from the six country case studies and regional survey and further triangulation and validation meetings at the regional level. The evaluation team used thematic analysis approach to analyse qualitative data from KIIs and FGDs and to identify key trends and patterns across the evaluation questions. A coding framework was designed in alignment with the evaluation questions and assumptions outlined in the matrix and key indicators in the Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Continuum. Emerging evidence was mapped against the GESI continuum."
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Partially	The methodology presented (theory based evaluation with mixed methods) does allow for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes. This is, however, not done in the report. Most of the results reporting focuses on programme activities and outputs.
	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	There is a description of the limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, but these focus mostly on the unavailability of informants as the evaluation was conducted during the school holidays. Other potential limitations and constraints like for example gaps in the evidence and potential bias are not considered.

<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).	Partially	The report states that the evaluation follows UNEG's Norms and Standards UNEG's Ethical Guidelines, and UNEG's Codes of Conduct for Evaluation, but no further elaboration is provided (apart from the mentioning of these documents). No explicit and contextualized references are made to the obligations of evaluators such as independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest or accountability, nor of integrity, respect or beneficence.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	The report states that the evaluators ensured safeguarding and ethics across all evaluation stages by ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity of participants, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of participants, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women and socially excluded groups) and ensuring that the evaluation results in no harm to participants or their communities. The evaluation team ensured that it had the appropriate authorizations to conduct data collection in selected provinces and districts, as well as in refugee camps. As regards involvement of children, including adolescents, the evaluation team consulted young people aged at least 18 and above, and adolescents aged 15 to 17. For minor adolescents, parental permission was obtained prior to consultations. Details on the specific actions undertaken by the evaluation team to conform to the above norms and standards are provided in Appendix XVIII. The Inception Report was subject to independent ethical review by the Health Media Lab (HML) Institutional Review Board. The ethics review approval letter is provided in Appendix XIX.
<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 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.	No	No innovative practices were used in this evaluation, and none were requested in the ToR.
<b>SECTION E:</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>	<b>42%</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.	Partially	The findings presented marshal sufficient levels of evidence to address most of the evaluation questions, sub-questions and criteria. All areas in the evaluation questions are covered, but some of the findings are presented without sufficient evidence; many of the presented findings build on what interviewees have said without any verification or triangulation. For example it is stated that "There is increasing evidence that the adopted approach is beginning to shift perceptions of young people and their capacities as leaders and change agents, with pathways beginning to unfold through UNICEF collaborations with young people", while no supporting evidence is presented.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	There is explicit use of the intervention's results framework in the formulation of some of the findings. Data from the results matrix is used to report on results in outcome areas such as early childhood education and nutrition.
<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.	Partially	The evaluation does partially use credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents mostly stakeholder perceptions from interviews and focus group discussions and progress performance data (activity reporting) and output-level data from the results matrix. Furthermore, in the results reporting, programme activities are presented as if there were results. While it is stated in the methods section that triangulation is used, this is not evident in the presentation of findings. For example, claims of positive results by stakeholder informants are not backed up by independent data from e.g., the results framework or national statistics or other sources.

	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.	Partially	Most findings are supported by evidence. For example, when stating that interviews with UNICEF Child Protection staff highlighted that the Country Office has taken a leadership role in advocating for any neglected areas or categories of children being left behind, thus guiding the government to define its priorities, examples to back up these claims are presented; "Accordingly, following UNICEF's advocacy and guidance, the national child protection system has grown substantially to now include a dedicated government operational plan on Child Protection and the establishment of the NCDA as a dedicated government institution for Child Protection in 2021 that did not previously exist, merging the National Commission for Children and the National ECD Programme. and they are not based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks or other means of comparison." Some findings are not based on clear performance indicators or other means of comparison, though.
	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).	Partially	Some causal factors leading to the achievement and non-achievement of results are identified and described. These findings, however, are not used to analyse the logical chain, as the logical chain is not analysed.
<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.	No	There is no assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system apart from identifying that there is a lack of gender disaggregation in the Country Programme Results Framework for indicators where this would be expected.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	<b>50%</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 clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking.
	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	While most of the conclusions are appropriately derived from findings in the evaluation (clearly numbered) and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings, clear statements of conclusions are lacking in the conclusion section. Instead of presenting the main conclusion (for each theme or part) in a clear sentence, conclusions are numbered and labelled with one or more key words as in short headings. It is often not clear in the following text what the main conclusion is. For example: "Conclusion 1: Investing in adolescent girls' voice, leadership and agency. UNICEF ESAR Regional and Country Offices are investing in adolescent girls' voice, leadership and agency as a central approach to gender transformative programming, as laid out in the Gender Action Plan 3. This has led to positive changes among individual adolescent girls in relation to their confidence, self-esteem and self-belief. A significant focus on their agency and leadership skills appears to be more centred at the programme level, with less evidence emerging of how this has translated into changes affecting their lives outside of the programme, across the socio-ecological model. The ambition to be more transformative has been recently set out in the GAP 3, and therefore it is not surprising that there is limited understanding, and capacity, among staff and partners of how to implement more gender transformative programmes, which work across the socio-ecological model, and seek to change deep seated norms, and remove structural barriers." Another example: "Conclusion 2: Sustainability. UNICEF COs and Programmes are well aligned with government priorities, global frameworks, and UNICEF's strategic plans, as such several sustainable benefits can be found within UNICEF programming, including contributing to national policies and training curricula, ensuring they include a gender focus and address the rights of adolescent girls, some of which is contributing to transformative policy or legal change." Further examples can be found on pages 70-80.
<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.	Partially	The lessons stem logically from some of the findings, but they are very specific to the Rwanda country programme and context and do not have wider applicability and relevance much beyond the object of the evaluation. There also seems to be a logical disconnect between the conclusions and the lessons (they focus on different matters).
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	The lessons are not clearly and concisely presented; they are a mix of findings and recommendations and are not formulated as lessons.
<b>SECTION G:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>75%</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 align with the evaluation purpose. They are clearly formulated and derive logically from the evaluation findings. The relevant findings leading to each conclusion are referenced in the recommendation table (Table 6.1 on pp 68-71).

	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 useful and actionable for the primary intended users and uses, they are relevant to the intervention and guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.
	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).	Partially	The process for developing the recommendations is described and it includes the involvement of duty bearers, but not rights holders. No explanation for why rights holders were not involved is given. The preliminary recommendations were shared with and commented on by a wide range of RCO staff and managers in September 2023. They were further discussed in a virtual presentation to the Evaluation Reference Group which was held in November 2023.
<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.	Partially	There is a clear identification of groups of duty bearers responsible for action for each recommendation. All 7 recommendations are marked high priority, however, and hence no real prioritization is made between them.
<b>SECTION H:</b>	<b>REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>57%</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.	Partially	The opening pages include name of the evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of the report, names and organizations of the evaluators, name of the commissioning organization, table of contents including tables and figures and list of acronyms, and page numbers. The location of the evaluated object is somewhat unclear (apart from it being in Rwanda), as no clear overview of the programme or its locations are presented in the main report (a list of number of interventions per region is presented in an implementation map in Annex II). Some acronyms used in the report are not in the list of acronyms (e.g., VAC) and some of the acronyms listed are not used in the report (e.g., CRC, CEDAW). There is no list of the annexes in the content table and no mention in the main report that the annexes are presented in a separate document. The page numbering in the table of content for the Annexes does not correspond with the pages' numbers.
	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.	Partially	The annexes include the terms of reference, an evaluation matrix, theories of change, list of interviewees, data collection instruments (such as interview protocols), and list of documents consulted. No list of site visits is attached.
<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 overall structure of the report is logical, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles and it is well formatted. The content within the sections is less clear and the presentation of the information (especially the findings) are unclear and messily presented. Some sections do not contain information in line with the titles/sub-titles, like e.g., section 2.2.2 "Budget and partners" contains no information regarding budget at all.
	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 overall report structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology precede findings, which are followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.
<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.	Partially	The report is relatively lengthy with 71 pages, which slightly exceeds the agreed length (the ToR states page limits to be determined in the inception phase, and the inception report states that the evaluation report should be no longer than 65 pages excluding annexes). The annexes are an additional 118 pages.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	No	The report is not easy to understand and does not give a clear picture of the country programme and its results. It is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors. The annexes contain some typos (especially the results matrix).
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report uses 11 figures and 12 tables to convey information. These are clearly presented, labelled and referenced in the text.
<b>SECTION I:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>	<b>76%</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.	Partially	The only references to the CRC and to CEDAW are in the list of acronyms; these conventions are otherwise not mentioned at all in the report. CCC is referred to as part of UNICEF's own work (in Finding 8: "UNICEF's Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs) principles have been applied mostly in the CP's emergency preparedness work, as well as through direct responses to humanitarian crises."), but is not mentioned in connection to this evaluation's principles. However, as part of the list of evaluation approaches, it is stated that a "Gender, Equity, Human Rights, and Inclusion Approach was applied to assess the extent to which the gender, equity and human rights principles were mainstreamed in CP design, delivery strategies and results achievement". It is furthermore stated that the evaluation was mainly framed around the Leaving No one Behind principle of the SDG 2030.
	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 is no clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation. It is mentioned that an evaluation reference group consisting of both internal and external stakeholders was established, but it does not specify who the internal and external stakeholders were.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	The language in the report is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias. It uses the terminology of rights holders and duty bearers, and data is disaggregated by marginalized groups when that type of data is available. The report points out areas where the country programme's indicators lack gender disaggregation.
	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	The evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind, and it is disability inclusive.
<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)	7	
	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	The evaluation assesses to what degree sufficient information was collected on specific indicators to measure progress on gender equality, and the findings are carried through to the recommendations. The evaluation includes an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations, and gender and human rights criteria were included in the evaluation framework.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation used a gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools including data analysis techniques. The evaluation specified how gender issues were addressed in the methodology, and a mixed-methods approach was employed appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations. A diverse set of data sources were employed, but triangulation and validation were weak. Ethical considerations were considered throughout the evaluation.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation's findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The evaluation has a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups benefiting from the UNICEF country program. The findings do not include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social groups, however. Unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality are not described. The evaluation does, however, provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues.

### SWAP Rating Guidance

<p><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.</b></p> <p>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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p><b>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</b></p> <p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>

**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?