

# GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

## Final Evaluation of the Adolescent Iron and Folic Acid (IFA) Intervention in Mangochi, Salima and Dedza Districts of Malawi

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
<b>Overall Rating</b>		72%	Satisfactory
●●●●●	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>	Final Evaluation of the Adolescent Iron and Folic Acid (IFA) Intervention in Mangochi, Salima and Dedza Districts of Malawi		
<b>Report sequence number</b>	Malawi/63/2022/18251		
<b>Region</b>	ESAR		
<b>Year of report</b>	2022		
<b>Office</b>	UNICEF Country Office Lilongwe Malawi		
<b>Coverage (countries)</b>	Malawi		
<b>ToRs present</b>	Yes		
<b>Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)</b>	February 13, 2023		
<b>Name of review firm</b>	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
<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	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	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
<b>Evaluation object</b>	Project		
<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>	2.2		
<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 evaluation report provides solid information regarding the project background and context and its justification. It also provides clear and solid information regarding the evaluation purpose, methodology and implementation. It is rights-based and gender- and disability-inclusive. It is well written and tidy. Some of the evaluation findings lack solid evidence, especially those relating to the project's effectiveness (i.e. the project's result). The evidence for reduction in rates of anaemia and improved nutritional status of project participants is weak and lacking. The evaluation's claim that the project has been successful is based on an assumption that this has worked as it has proved to work in other countries, and does not provide specific evidence as to how and to what degree it has worked in this specific project.</p>		
<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>		
	<p>The evaluation would have benefitted from a slightly different evaluation design to ensure that evidence of what has worked and not in the project would have been better captured. Results related to reduction of levels of anaemia and improvements in nutritional status could have been better captured if baseline data and monitoring data of the participants anaemia- and nutritional status would have been used and compared to the participants anaemia- and nutritional status at project closure. References to national statistics (before and after the project) provides no information about the success or failure of this specific programme.</p>		
SECTION RATINGS			
<b>SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)</b>		100%	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).	Yes	The executive summary serves as a standalone document, useful for informing decision making. It is of relevant conciseness and depth while still succinct with its 4 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.	Yes	The executive summary includes all necessary elements, i.e. overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions and findings, and recommendations. For some of the recommendations presented in the Executive Summary, there is a lack of corresponding findings. (For example, for the recommendation about fuel provision, no findings referring to lack of fuel provision is presented).
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 executive summary includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation, although the description of the methodology could have been clearer. It does not introduce new information that is not presented in the main text of the report.
<b>SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)</b>		100%	Comments on Rating

<b>Question 2.</b>	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The intervention is clearly described, including locations, timelines, cost and financial contributors, and the implementation status.
	ii Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability... (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	There is a clear and relevant description of the intended rightsholders and duty bearers by type, geographic location and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by age and gender, as appropriate for the evaluation.
<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	The project context and the relevant health situation of the target group are clearly described.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Linkages are drawn to SGD target 2.2 and specifically indicator 2.2.3.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The description of the rights-holders/beneficiaries is clear and relevant.
<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 report clearly identifies the implementing agencies, development partner and duty bearers. It outlines the linkages between them and there is a clear stakeholder map presented in the report.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders, including UNICEF, are outlined.
<b>SECTION C:</b>	<b>EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	83%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 5.</b>	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The evaluation purpose is clearly defined, included its intended use and users.
<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	There is a description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the proses, and changes made to the objectives in the ToR are made clear.
	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	There is a description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the proses, and changes made to the objectives in the ToR are made clear.
<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.	Partially	The report outlines that the two main evaluation questions are 1) whether the intervention succeeded in achieving its desired results; and 2) whether the intervention was able to improve nutritional status of adolescents. It does not outline clearly, however, what the desired results were.
	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 not clearly presented in the main text of the report. A theory of change is outlined in the findings section of the report (and of Change on the last page of Annex 9) with relevant elements identified, but this theory of change does not seem to have been used actively as part of the evaluation, to test the assumptions and to measure the expected outputs and outcomes. Furthermore, it is somewhat unclear as the text focuses on inputs and activities rather than outputs and outcomes with related indicators and targets.
	iii For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Yes	A proposed theory of change is presented in Annex 9.
<b>SECTION D:</b>	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)</b>	65%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 8.</b>	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified.

	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.	Partially	There is an evaluation matrix in Annex 2. However, the matrix is somewhat vague in that the results to be measured (the objectives of the intervention) are not specified there either and the matrix lacks identified indicators, benchmarks, etc. to measure the achievements of the expected results.
<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.	Partially	The evaluation design and set of methods could have been better aligned to the purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation did interviews and focus group discussions, etc. only with participants of the programme. Not having created comparison groups (of non-participants) to measure the same elements (of dietary habits, degrees of anaemia, (mal)nutrition, of non-participants etc. is a true missed opportunity to determine the attributable effects of this concrete intervention.
	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	Data sources are relevant (except from the lack of comparison group data), and they are described in the report.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	A sampling strategy is provided. It does not include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	There is a clear description of the methods of analysis in the report.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	No	The methodology does not allow for drawing clear causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes for two reasons: 1) The evaluation methodology did not include comparison groups to better determine contribution/attribution from this project; and 2) it was decided (in consultation with UNICEF) to not measure rates of anaemia (which was part of the original evaluation questions), with the justification that this was scheduled to be conducted by the forthcoming Malawi Demographic and Health Survey (MDHS) of 2022/23 by the National Statistical Office (NSO). However, a national health survey will only provide health information of a population as a whole and will not be able to provide relevant information to show how and to what degree this specific intervention has had an effect on the beneficiaries' rates of anaemia. Only an assessment of the participants' rates of anaemia would provide such information, and this omission created a clear weakness of the evaluation.
	vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	The evaluation report provides a clear description of the limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation.
<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	There is an explicit reference to the 2020 UNEG's Ethical Guidelines, but the report does not specifically reference the details of the guidelines such as integrity, accountability, respect and beneficence, nor does it specifically refer to the evaluators obligations (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability).
	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.	Partially	There is a paragraph in the report covering ethical safeguards. Explicit reference is not made to UNICEF's procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.
<b>Question 11.</b>		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i	Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Not Rated	Not applicable
<b>SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)</b>			<b>58%</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	Some of the findings presented are supported by evidence. A sufficient level of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions, sub-questions and criteria is not presented, and evidence related to the effectiveness criteria is especially weak.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	There is an outline of the ToR as part of the findings (addressing the evaluation question asking for a ToR), but there is no explicit use of the intervention's results framework or ToC in the formulation of the findings.

<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 report presents some claims of achievements that are not backed up with evidence. References are given directly to interviews with stakeholders and their claims are taken at face value without being tested and/or triangulated. For example, KII's claims that "this project has had a huge impact on the participants' health and education" is presented without any evidence to back it up. Also, data on eating habits and nutrition are only collected through self-reporting surveys and are not validated against more objective and measurable data nor triangulated. Furthermore, the beneficiaries' potential weight gain are not measured against their own weight charts or baseline data (unclear if they even exist), but is compared to the average weight of their age group as registered in the last MDHS of 2014/15. It is plausible that the project has had a positive effect on the participants' health and nutrition status, but the evidence presented to back this up is weak. The evaluation is not providing solid evidence of this projects' results in terms of changes in the prevalence of anaemia nor of the participants' nutritional status.
	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	Some of the findings presented are supported by evidence. Some findings (and especially those related to the effectiveness (results) of the project, are not based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks or other means of comparison. See also comments and examples in the box above.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	Causal factors (contextual and organizational) influencing achievement and non-achievement are clearly identified and presented, such as for example how the prevailing misconception that the IFA supplements are contraceptive pills have led to a lower than desired uptake. Another example is the outlining of how UNICEF-created parallel structures might be less efficient and do not strengthen the governmental structures.
<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.	Partially	There is no clear assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (it is unclear what actually has been monitored beyond the distribution of pills) or results framework in the report. The report states that there were challenges with monitoring as data was generally kept only in hard copies at the schools and health facilities. It is further stated that the inability of the District Nutrition Offices to compute results from schools and health facilities resulted in a lack of data to demonstrate project progress. Inability by the District Nutrition, and this made it difficult to quantify some of the indicators of the project using routine monitoring data. However, apart from this reporting on the monitoring difficulties (related to lack of fuel for project staff to travel around to do the monitoring), there is no clear assessment of the project's results framework and the content of the monitoring design.
<b>SECTION F:</b>	<b>EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS &amp; LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)</b>	63%	Comments on Rating
<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).	Partially	The Conclusions section does mainly focus on the assumed positive impact of the project on the levels of anaemia in adolescent girls (of which there is weak evidence), and on the fact that this (the reduction of anaemia in adolescent girls) is an unfinished agenda and that the Government and UNICEF are planning to scale this up. No other conclusions related to the other evaluation questions are presented.
	ii Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	The first conclusion presented in the Conclusions section ("In conclusion, the Adolescent IFA Intervention is a success looking at the impact and lessons generated.") is not based on evidence presented in the report. As pointed out earlier in the report, there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate the achievements of the project. In the conclusions, it is first claimed that this intervention (to pre-test the use of iron and folic acid to reduce anaemia among adolescent girls (10-19 years) has shown tangible results, while in the following sentence it is stated that no study has been conducted to assess levels of anaemia. It is further assumed that despite the lack of any measurements of the rates of anaemia, that "reductions in anaemia are anticipate to be huge" in the three pilot areas based on the number of pills distributed and that (an unknown number) of those have been ingested by girls while monitored by teachers and health workers. Assumptions of success and impact cannot be drowned based on such lack of evidence. The other conclusions are more realistic and are for the most part derived from the findings presented earlier in the report.
<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 presented in paragraphs 162-169 are not formulated as lessons, but as findings. They are not written in a way that have a wider applicability and relevance beyond the project. The content of the lessons section does stem logically from the findings presented earlier in the report.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons (as stated above) are not formulated as lessons but as findings, however, the content of the lessons section have sufficient detail to be useful for the intended audience.
<b>SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>		63%	Comments on Rating
<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.	Partially	The recommendations align with the evaluation purpose in that they are well related to the evaluation questions. However, not all of them are derived well from the evaluation findings. For example, the first recommendation to scale up to the project to other districts is justified not by the findings of the evaluation (probably because the evidence of the results of the project wrt reduction of anaemia is weak and partly lacking), but is justified by a statement that there is a need for IFA supplements in the regions not yet covered since the rates of anaemia are still high there, and that "IFA supplements have already proved successful in other countries".
	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 and the table presented in the Conclusions and Recommendations section provides guidance for implementation.
	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 of developing the recommendations is not described and it is unclear to what extent rights-holders and duty-bearers were involved.
<b>Question 18.</b>	Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Yes	There is a clear identification of the groups of duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation.
<b>SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)</b>		100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 19.</b>	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages include the name of the evaluated object, the evaluation's timeframe, report date, names of the donor organizations and the implementing agency, the organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents, list of acronyms, etc. There is no list of the annexes, and the annexes are not included in the table of contents.
	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Yes	The annexes include the ToR, an evaluation matrix, a suggested ToC, lists of interviewees and site visits and data collection instruments and tools, and information about the evaluators.
<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).	Yes	The report structure is good and tidy.
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The structure of the report accords to UNICEF's guidelines for evaluation reports and has sections on the context, purpose and methodology preceding the findings and followed by the 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.	Yes	The report is of reasonable length and is following the guidance outlined in the ToR.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is well written and is easy to understand and is generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.
	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	There is a sufficient use of visual aids in the report to convey key information. These are clear presented, labelled and referenced in the text.
<b>SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)</b>		100%	Comments on Rating
<b>Question 22.</b>	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	The evaluation report use a rights-based framework and is specifically referring to the CRC.

	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	The report provides a clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation.
	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 report language is empowering and inclusive and data is disaggregated by marginalized groups; age, gender and disability.
	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 is clearly disability inclusive and gender sensitive. This was built into the ToR and the report responds well to that.
<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)	9	
	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 fully integrated a human rights and gender perspective, as did the evaluated project.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The evaluation methods and tools selected were gender responsive.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

### 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>
<p><b>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</b></p> <p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>