

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of Water Safety for the Wellbeing of Women and Children in Bangladesh Project

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	58%	Fair	
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may use the evaluation with caution. Substantive improvements in some areas are needed
●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report	Evaluation of Water Safety for the Wellbeing of Women and Children in Bangladesh Project		
Report sequence number	Bangladesh-64-2022-18402		
Region	SAR		
Year of report	2021		
Office	UNICEF Bangladesh Country Office		
Coverage (countries)	Bangladesh		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)	January 23, 2023		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
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	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	No		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Evaluation object	Project		
Evaluation type	Summative and formative		
Evaluation strategy	Qualitative		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	6.1 and 6.2		
EQA Summary: <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>			
The main strengths include: - The evaluation report is well structured and clearly written with a clear presentation of the context, background and components of the project. - The ToCs are clear and logical and the presentation of methodology and limitations are clear and candid.			
Main weaknesses include: - The assessment of the project's achievements are based on weak or lacking evidence, mainly leaning on information obtained in interviews and focal group discussions without verifying the information or triangulating it. - The project's logical framework (which is of good quality) is not used in the assessment. - Achievements are reported but not compared to the target values in the logical framework which makes it difficult to assess whether and to what degree the project has achieved its intended output and outcomes. - The lessons section is weak in that none of the bullet points presented are formulated as lessons; they are either findings or recommendations. - The report is also nearly double the length of the specified requirement in the ToR.			
Recommendations for Improvement: <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 evaluation report would benefit from: 1) make use of the project's available monitoring data for reporting on achievements to verify and triangulate claims by key informants; 2) make use of qualitative and quantitative evidence to substantiate findings 3) compare the verified achievements to the target values in the results framework/logical framework in order to assess whether and to what degree the project has achieved its intended results at output and outcome (and impact) levels; 4) Write lessons in lessons format, and not as findings or recommendations; and 5) Stick to the requested number of pages for the report.			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	83%	Comments on Rating	
Question 1. Can the executive summary inform decision-making?			
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 is clearly presented and serves as a standalone document. It is clear and concise and provides all relevant key information for decision making and key users.	

	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	The Executive summary includes a clear overview of the intervention, its components and targeted beneficiaries. It also includes a good description of the evaluation purpose, its main objectives and audience. A clear and concise description of the evaluation methodology is also provided. Under the Lessons section, the information is presented as a mix of findings and recommendations, and it is not formulated as lessons. The recommendations presented in the executive summary are not clearly derived from the findings and lessons presented earlier in the executive summary.
	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 evaluation and the intervention.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			100%	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	The project is very clearly described including locations, the budget and final costs, location, beneficiaries, etc. A map of the project areas are presented in the Methods section, (but not in the Background section).
	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 description of the intended rightsholders and duty bearers by type, geographic location and target numbers are clearly presented in the report.
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.	Yes	The context is described well with sufficient detail. The challenges with ground water supply and with sanitation is clearly presented including how the influx of Rohingya refugees have complicated the situation and how the intervention is placed in and responds to this context.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Linkages are drawn to SDG 6.1 (universal access to "safely-managed" water1 for all by 2030) and SDG 6.2 (universal access to basic sanitation by 2030).
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	Clear and relevant description of the right holders, and the project is referring to the relevant children's rights in terms of access to clean water, etc.
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 key stakeholders are clearly identified and their roles outlined and well described including government counterparts, implementing agency, NGOs and beneficiaries. No graphic or stakeholder map outlined.
	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 are clearly described and specified.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			67%	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.	Partially	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined. However the reason for why it is needed at this point in time is not clear. The intended users are listed, and the intended use of the evaluation is stated to help in the future planning of WASH interventions, especially in water services provision.
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).	Partially	There is no clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process.
	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 of the evaluation is covered well in the report. Project and components are outlined, and the project time period to be covered. The reasons for the limited scope is outlined, and limitations are clearly and candidly presented.
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.	Yes	The project's intended results are clearly described.
	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 ToC presented early in the report is clear and with logical links between inputs outputs, outcomes and goals. However, it only covers one of the two components as it is only a copy of the project's early ToC prior to the addition of the second component. The evaluation team reconstructed the ToC for the second component, and this is also clear and logical. However, the ToCs are not used in the report's narrative and assessment of effectiveness.

	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.	Partially	The ToC presented in the report is clear and with logical links between inputs outputs, outcomes and goals. However, the ToC only covers one of the two components as it is only a copy of the project's early ToC prior to the addition of the second component. No reconstructed ToC for the full project is presented in the report.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	68%	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	The evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation criteria of efficiency and impact were excluded, based on discussions between UNICEF and Sida to meet the need of a reduced evaluation scope.
	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 or benchmarks, assumptions or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn. The evaluation matrix includes sub-questions, but is limited to list the potential information sources and the degree of evaluability of each question.
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 design and set of methods are relevant and robust for the evaluation's purpose. It would have been beneficial to the evaluation if more consultations with beneficiaries/end users could have been included in the evaluation, but this limitation is clearly described in the report and was agreed between UNICEF and Sida at the outset and accepted by the evaluation team.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The data sources were mostly qualitative (documents review, interviews and Focal Group Discussions), and they are clearly described. Relevant monitoring data from the project is not used in the evaluation report.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The sampling strategy is described, - and was used to ensure representativity of the findings.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The methods of analysis is adequately described in the report.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology would in theory allow for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes, and the original and the reconstructed Toc's in the report are clear and logical.
	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	There is a clear and candid description of the limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including the limited scope of the evaluation and COVID-related limitations.
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).	No	No explicit or contextual reference is made to the UNEG obligations of evaluators regarding impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest or accountability, nor of the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines.
	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	General references are made to the UNEG norms, standards and ethical guidelines, including the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation (Annex D), and it is stated that the team upheld the 'Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluations' and the 'UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis'. It is not specified how these standards and guidelines were applied concretely in this evaluation, though. It is stated, however, that religious and cultural sensitivity were ensured during all interactions with the refugee and the host communities.
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 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 evaluation practices are mentioned in the report.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	17%	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.	No	The findings presented in the report are not backed up with sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria. The report presents several claims of success without backing these up with sufficient evidence or triangulation.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	There are clear and logical ToCs for both components in the report. The ToCs are not actively used, however, in the reporting of achievements and there is a general lack of data to back up the claims of achievements throughout the report. Monitoring data from the project is used only sporadically and when presented, it is not compared to target values; this means that it is not possible for the reader to determine whether or to what degree the project's output and outcome targets were achieved.
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.	No	The evaluation does not use sufficiently credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data in that several claims of achievements are made, but more often than not these are not backed up by any evidence. Triangulation is mentioned in the methods section, but not used in the evaluation report. Examples: "This project also supported the GoB's efforts to update and formulate new policies by supporting the Policy Support Branch (PSB) activities." It is not clear whether or to what degree the outputs of this (several policies and strategies developed) were attributable to this project. It is also not reported on how these achievements compare to the project's intended results, which makes it impossible to assess whether and to what degree the project achieved its intended outcomes and goals. Another example: "The participants claimed that they were all aware of safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene issues. Furthermore, they were satisfied with water quality, their residences' proximity, and segregation of sanitation facilities." This is presented as a finding supporting project achievement. However, this is not verified or triangulated with monitoring data or other measurable sources of information. Utterances from interviews are often taken at face value and presented in the report as findings or facts without verification or triangulation.
	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.	No	The report claims that success is achieved, however does not present evidence to back up those claims. Example: "Specific interventions (such as arsenic safe water points and community awareness) have led to clear outputs (behavioural change in the community and a scalable model for the provision of safe drinking water) and turn these outputs to outcomes (improved access to safe water) and outcomes to impact (better health and education for rural households). No evidence is presented to show behavioural change in the community, improved access to safe drinking water or better health and education for rural households. These were not measured and not reported on. Another example: "The evaluation team found evidence of specific gender aspects. The project director (PD) stated that women and children are always the focus of DPHE-UNICEF WASH activities." Similar claims are put forward, but these are not backed up with evidence (M&E figures, etc). The evaluation team use the qualitative nature of the evaluation as an excuse not to report on concrete figures. Example: "Due to the qualitative nature of this evaluation, it was not possible to provide any quantitative figures regarding access to water and proximity to households within the community." It is not clear why they have not been able to triangulate interview data with monitoring data from the project. Monitoring data regarding number of water sources provided and their locations should have been available from project documents. The report contains sentences like: "There was some anecdotal evidence of benefits to vulnerable and marginalised populations." with no further presentation of evidence or information. It is also stated in the report that "This project also supported the GoB's efforts to update and formulate new policies by supporting the Policy Support Branch (PSB) activities", and lists a number of strategies and policies developed. <u>Whether and to what degree the production of these policies and</u>
	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	Causal factors leading to achievement of results are identified, but claims of achievement of these are not backed up with evidence in the main text of the report.
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.	No	No assessment of the projects monitoring system is presented in the report. Moreover, the report does not use the project's results framework (which is in the report's annex C Project Log frames) in the evaluation report. Project achievements are not compared to the indicators and targets identified and listed in the project's Results Framework/Logical Framework.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	38%	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).	Yes	The conclusions are fairly clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objective of the evaluation.
	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	Some of the conclusions are derived from findings, but does not necessarily present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.

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.	No	The identified lessons do not stem logically from the presented findings and some of them do not have a 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.	No	The bullet points in the lessons section are not formulated as lessons; some are findings and some are recommendations. They are not clearly and concisely presented. Example: "There is often an insufficient number of DPHE mechanics in local areas. However, if there is good demand from the community to reduce repair times, the number of private-sector mechanics will increase. Future projects in the sector can target more training for local private drillers and their certification.", where the first sentence is a finding and the last sentence is a recommendation, and this "lesson" does not have relevance beyond this project.
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.	Yes	The recommendations align with the evaluation purpose and are derived from the findings and conclusions.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	Some of the recommendations are useful, but most of them are not actionable for primary intended users, and guidance is not given for implementation. Example: "Further investments are required to develop comprehensive aquifer mapping in Bangladesh. Further research is required in relating sediments and water quality of different aquifers in Bangladesh."
	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. The recommendations were developed through a consultative process and were confirmed with a range of stakeholders through a validation workshop that was held online. Only duty-bearers and no right-holders participated. No reason for the absence of right-holders is given.
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	A group of duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation is listed in the report. There is also a clear prioritization of the recommendations.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	86%	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.	Yes	The opening pages include all the required information such as name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of the report, location of evaluated object, names and organisational affiliations of the evaluators, table of contents including list of tables and annexes, list of acronyms and page 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.	Yes	The annexes include all the required information such as the ToR, the evaluation matrix (although this is weak), list of interviewees, list of site visits including photos, interview questionnaires and a list of documents consulted.
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 report structure is easy to identify and 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 accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports. Context, purpose and methodology is presented before the findings, conclusions and recommendations.
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, with its 55 pages excluding annexes, is nearly double the maximum length of 30 pages as requested 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 easy to understand and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation mistakes.
	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 use of visual aids such as infographics, maps and photos are adequately used in the report to convey information. These are clearly presented, labelled and referenced in the text.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	81%	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	References are made to children's rights to clean and safe water and sanitation facilities.
	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	There is a clear description of how duty-bearers and rights-holders have been involved in the evaluation as KIIs and in FGDs.
	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 inclusive and is avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious biases. Data is disaggregated by gender whenever possible.
	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 gender and other excluded groups, and it is disability inclusive (assessed disability access, etc.).
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)	5	
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Satisfactorily integrated	GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope, and it is part of the first evaluation question.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation takes gender into account and the situation of women and girls and other marginalized groups is described and assessed.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect gender aspects in the project, but a full gender analysis is not undertaken.

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>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.</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>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</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>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</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>