

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of UNICEF's work on cash transfer programming in emergencies - Country Report Nepal

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	68%	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	
Title of the evaluation report	Evaluation of UNICEF's work on cash transfer programming in emergencies - Country Report Nepal
Report sequence number	Nepal/64/2021/18256
Region	EAPR
Year of report	2021
Office	Evaluation Office
Coverage (countries)	Nepal
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	January 15, 2021
Name of review firm	DefEdge Corporation

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	UNICEF managed
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)	
Every child survives and thrives	No
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)	No
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes
Evaluation object	Programme
Evaluation type	Summative and formative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Non-experimental
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome
Geographic scope	National
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	not specified

EQA Summary:
 This is a satisfactory report. The evaluation seeks to document both results (summative) and lessons that can be carried forward and used in the future (formative). There is a clear description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve, and reference to limitations from what was originally planned, notably the inability to conduct any sort of impact assessment, which is consistent across all case studies. The ToR is available for the global study, though not clearly annexed and accessible. Drawing on extensive document review and interviews with duty-bearers, most of whom are UNICEF staff, it is able to obtain findings, conclusions and make recommendations that are useful both to the country offices as well as to the larger evaluation. Both qualitative and quantitative data are used and triangulation evident, within the limits noted below. In most cases there is sufficient level of evidence to support findings, however the Nepal case study relies on few quantitative sources, and one frequently referenced report. The conclusions are derived from the findings and provide a clear overarching picture of the strengths and limitations of the programme. The targeting system and delayed delivery of payments were significant barriers to programme effectiveness in Nepal, and a set of broad recommendations are made to improve cash transfer programme effectiveness.

Recommendations for Improvement:

The executive summary is only approximately three pages, and could be expanded by including a more expansive discussion of key findings, conclusions and lessons that led to the recommendations, as well as a more thorough description of the intervention in Nepal, and the methodology specific to the Nepal case study. Without a clear description on how sampling was conducted for the selection of interviewees and with few interviews conducted, it is difficult to assess whether the data sources are diverse, inclusive and appropriate. The design could have had a more detailed evaluation of gender and other vulnerability aspects, as it tended to lump many identities together under 'vulnerable groups' without any analysis of the differential needs and effects of the cash transfer on various groups. In addition, a country-specific Theory of Change could have been presented (which was mentioned as available) and assessed. While lessons are integrated throughout the findings, a specific lessons section would ensure the evaluation clearly responds to its purpose and objectives.

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	33%	Comments on Rating
Question 1.	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).	No	The executive summary is 3 pages. This consists of two pages of findings and recommendations that are placed into a poorly formatted table and provide minimal detail on findings, conclusions and recommendations, significantly limiting utility as a stand-alone document to be used for decision-making. The intervention, methods and limitations of the study specific to Nepal are not mentioned; instead, it lists the methodology for Dominica, a separate case study, though the methodology is largely the same.
	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	There is no overview of the intervention in Nepal specifically and the intended audience is not explicitly mentioned. Many of the findings are phrased more like recommendations.

	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 executive summary is extremely brief and explains the overall study, but not the specific case study in any significant detail.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		64%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.	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	Chapter 2 provides details on the context of UNICEF's work on cash transfers in emergencies in Nepal, a country highly vulnerable to natural disasters. An overview of the various social assistance programmes, including the target groups, transfer amounts, and transfer schedules, is provided in Table 2. A clear timeline of the 2015 response, which extended into 2016, is provided in Figure 2 along with a clear description of the numbers reached and budgets for the different phases.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability... (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	The rightsholders and duty bearers are described within the context of UNICEF's work on cash transfers in emergencies in Nepal. In Nepal, the emergency, and therefore scope of the assistance programme, was national. The numbers reached are provided, including the number of children reached, though not disaggregated by gender, age or disability since transfers were made at household-level.
Question 3.	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	The context focuses on Nepal's vulnerability to natural disasters, and notes the negative impact on children. Dynamics of power/privilege, and the disparate impacts of natural disasters on different groups is not comprehensively covered, though Nepal does have social protection programmes for separate groups (single women, senior citizens, endangered ethnicities, and persons with disabilities).
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	The linkages to SDGs were not explicitly drawn.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The status and needs of rightsholders/beneficiaries after natural disasters are briefly mentioned, though not covered in significant detail. The findings section also briefly describes beneficiary needs related to the needs assessments conducted, but this section only notes that needs were met and beneficiaries satisfied, not which needs were met.
Question 4.	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 various stakeholders were well-described.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	The contributions and roles were described. The role of UNICEF is clear, but the role of WFP and the Government are not as clear.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		90%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.	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 case study provides a description of the purpose of the larger system-wide evaluation of cash transfers. The global evaluation seeks to document both results (summative) and lessons that can be carried forward and used in the future (formative). The key intended users for Nepal are identified.
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?			
	i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	The evaluation has four overarching objectives intended to capture key results as well as good practices and lessons to carry forward in Nepal and globally. The objectives are mostly still in line with the ToR, though the study was originally intended to also measure impact, and this was not possible given data and stakeholder accessibility constraints. The ToR is available for the global study as a separate document, though not annexed to either the global document or case studies as expected and standard.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	The scope is briefly described under the description of the evaluation subject, largely in terms of providing the global criteria which were used to select case study countries, including Nepal. In Nepal, it is assumed that coverage was for the entire response to the 2015 earthquakes, which reached 730,000 households with a one-off transfer. The role of the wider context and non-programme specific technical assistance and inputs to make social protection systems shock-responsive was considered a 'second level' to the evaluation.
Question 7.	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 intended results are largely clear. An ex-post evaluation theory of change is provided and provides clear graphic and written explanation on its logic. The same theory of change is used for the larger synthesis report summarizing all cash transfer programmes. It would have been useful to also provide a country-specific theory of change, especially in clearly identifying the expected change for beneficiary households, which was an expectation of the ToR at inception phase.
	ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	Yes	The causal connections are clear and presented in narrative and graphic forms.
	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	This was not a theory-based evaluation.

SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	73%	Comments on Rating
Question 8.	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	There are four main evaluation questions which are aligned with the evaluation's purpose of measuring results and generating forward-looking insights to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of cash-based transfer programming. The questions and sub-questions are consistent with the OECD/DAC guidance, and the criteria are included within the annexed evaluation matrix (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability).
	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 is very detailed and well done, including indicators, attributes for testing and further analysis, and data sources.
Question 9.	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 evaluation took a comparative case study approach and the set of methods for data collection are relevant and clear, including key informant interviews and extensive document review. Within the limits imposed by COVID-19, the evaluation design is sufficiently robust.
	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	The many documents and in-depth interviews provide enough detail to permit an assessment of the programme. Surveys or focus group discussions were not possible given constraints posed by COVID-19, and no other attempts were made to reach end beneficiaries through other remote means. There are relatively few interviews (19) for an in-depth case study, most of whom were duty-bearers at national and sub-national levels, including UNICEF staff (8) and government officials (6) or other humanitarian agents (4). Only one community representative was interviewed and the sex of respondents is not provided. Further, without a clear sampling methodology provided, it is difficult to fully understand whether the interviewees were appropriate and sufficiently diverse. It appears more could have been done to reach more representatives of beneficiaries, such as CSOs or community leaders, through remote interviews.
	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 methodology for interviews appears to be purposive but is not made clear. Travel and movement restrictions imposed by COVID-19 limited the inclusion of voices of affected populations.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Methods of qualitative analysis are described very briefly and were facilitated by NVivo.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Partially	The causal connections can be observed in the global Theory of Change, which also facilitated the coding structure and data analysis in NVivo. The expected outcomes for beneficiaries are broad and defined at the global level, not specific to the Nepal cash transfer response, which specifically targeted households with children under-five. Also, notably, the context section notes that Nepal's social assistance programmes are highly fragmented and not designed to yet to build resilience or to respond to emergencies, yet these are key impacts measured by the global theory of change. This further justifies a need for both a national and global Theory of Change which clearly draws out the specific intended causal connections (at national level) as well as desired connections (in the global ToC).
	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 main limitations have to do with COVID-19 and the stated inability to reach vulnerable and affected populations. Mitigation measures for being unable to collect primary data from beneficiaries and community members, as originally planned, mostly involved further document review and triangulation of secondary data sources.
Question 10.	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 clear reference to UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016). The obligations were listed but the report text did not explain in any detail how they were adhered to by the evaluation team.
	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 standards of informed consent, anonymity and voluntariness of answers, and the right to self-determination are explained. Since the evaluation approach was primarily the review of secondary data sources, it is not expected that significant ethical issues would arise, and the evaluators note that no issues did emerge in data collection. Either way, the evaluation design did go through an ethical approval process and received official approval.

Question 11.	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.	No	There was no clear innovation. Most limitations were overcome through standard means of triangulation.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	75%	Comments on Rating
Question 12.	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. ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes Yes	The evaluation questions are methodically addressed. The findings are based on the Theory of Change.
Question 13.	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. 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. 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 Partially Yes	Both qualitative and quantitative data are used and triangulation evident, though there is more limited quantitative data available or used for the Nepal case study. Sources are consistently cited, though the report heavily drew from one report authored by Mertens, Upadhyay, Kukrety, Karki, & Majeed in 2017. In most cases, there is sufficient level of evidence to support findings, which are both positive and negative. However, the findings are numerous, and as such not always fully substantiated at the country-level. For example, finding 3.11.2 is only one sentence, and finding 4.4.2 notes the response from interviews on UNICEF's comparative advantage, however interviews were largely only UNICEF staff and so the sources of this information could have been better cited (partners, government, staff, etc.) or could reference earlier sections where communication campaigns were highlighted. Causal factors are clearly described, when available. Key evaluation question three on 'the design and implementation parameters that foster and/or impede effective and efficient delivery' also directly responds to this sub-criterion. The targeting system and delayed delivery of payments were significant barriers to programme effectiveness.
Question 14.	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	The analysis briefly assesses the adequacy of the ECTP's monitoring and evaluation system and tools, however the completeness and appropriateness of the theory of change and results framework, which are noted as available, are not assessed. The targeting system, including targeting registries, is extensively assessed. There is a recommendation on improving the monitoring and evaluation of emergency cash transfers, and especially the use of generated evidence, which was limited in Nepal.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	63%	Comments on Rating
Question 15.	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). 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 Yes	The conclusions are clearly formulated and forward-looking, and structured around the four core evaluation objectives. The conclusions are derived from the findings and provide a clear overarching picture of the strengths and limitations of the ECTP and of UNICEF's collaboration with the government to deliver it.
Question 16.	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. ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially No	There is no unique section on lessons learned. However, Objective 4 is primarily focused on lessons learned, and the conclusions under this objective capture some key, forward-looking insights, however more could be noted. Lessons are integrated into the main report findings. There is no unique section on lessons, but considering the learning objectives of the evaluation, this likely should have been included and is considered good practice.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	75%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.	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. ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes Yes	Recommendations are broad, but provide a set of more detailed and actionable recommendations which are clearly related to the purpose. Each recommendation is linked to a set of numbered findings. The recommendations are detailed and have broad intended users; most are directed to UNICEF CO.

	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	There is no evidence of involvement of duty-bearers or rightsholders in the formulation of recommendations in the text.
Question 18.		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	The recommendations suggest which duty-bearers are responsible and a clear prioritization category (medium or high).
SECTION H:		REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	64%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.		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 most of the information, however the timeframe of the evaluation is not mentioned.
	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	Only the evaluation matrix is included.
Question 20.		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 structure is clear and easy to navigate.
	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 follows the guidelines.
Question 21.		Is the report well presented?		
	i	Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	No	The report is of reasonable length at 53 pages, however the ToR specifies that each country report should not be longer than 20 pages.
	ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	It is easy to read and free from errors.
	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.	Partially	Visual aids, mostly in the form of color-coded tables, are used. The findings section is text-heavy.
SECTION I:		EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	45%	Comments on Rating
Question 22.		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 design included a question for specifically assessing alignment with key rights-based frameworks, including the CCC and UNICEF's Strategic Plan. The CCC was referenced and alignment assessed for most commitments, though alignment was not possible to be assessed in the Nepal case study for commitment four due to lack of evidence and noted as a footnote.
	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	Duty-bearers were included but not rights-holders since COVID-19 made reaching them impossible. The extent to which a reference group was established and consulted is not included.
	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	The expected inclusive language and terminology were used. However, differential results are not assessed and the evaluation frequently refers to 'vulnerable groups' broadly, and 'the needs of the most vulnerable', but does not ever attempt to define who the most vulnerable are in Nepal, nor what their needs are.
	iv	Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Partially	The programme focuses on vulnerable groups and child rights according to the priorities outlined in UNICEF's mandate and Strategic Plan 2018-2021. Disability inclusion is not extensively or purposively addressed, nor gender. As mentioned, vulnerability is used frequently without defining membership to this broad classification.
Question 23.		Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	2	
	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.	Partially integrated	GEEW is not apparent in the scope or objectives. Evaluation question one queries about the unexpected impacts of the most vulnerable boys, girls and women in emergency settings. As such, gender is mostly addressed as an aspect of vulnerability.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	Gender is a consideration included in many of the case studies, mixed-methods are used, and ethical practices are mentioned, however there are key limitations and omissions: for example, the stakeholders interviewed are not disaggregated by sex, there is a lack of clarity on the sampling process for stakeholders interviewed to understand the diversity of stakeholder respondents, and rightsholders were not engaged in data collection.
	iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Not at all integrated	There were no findings, conclusions or recommendations that were specific to gender nor showing a clear gender analysis was conducted.

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?