

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Real Time Assessment number two of UNICEF's Response to COVID-19

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	78%	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	Real Time Assessment number two of UNICEF's Response to COVID-19		
Report sequence number	MENARO, Jordan/59/2021/18437		
Region	MENAR		
Year of report	2021		
Office	MENARO, Jordan		
Coverage (countries)			
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	9/9/2025		
Name of review firm	IOD Parc		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of eval)	UNICEF managed		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
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)	Yes		
Evaluation object	Organization/business unit		
Evaluation type	Summative and formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Other		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	Regional		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)			
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>			
This is a solid real-time assessment of the UNICEF MENA COVID-19 response. Its intent is to produce lessons to improve future COVID-19 response efforts by leveraging the experiences of selected COs and RO during the initial COVAX implementation since the pandemic and to see how UNICEF's response has evolved since the last RTA. The evaluation used mixed methods to collect qualitative and quantitative data from desk review, interviews with CO Staff, RO Staff, Government, ACT-A partner agency staff, implementing partners, and frontline workers. A semi-structured survey was also conducted with UNICEF staff, national NGOs, and frontline workers. It is noted that interview participants were selected using purposive sampling in consultation with the MENARO evaluation team and CO focal points. Recommendations appear to provide important direction for decision making, however they could be more clearly formulated to increase usability. Gender is covered in a dedicated section in findings, though ethical practices and how the process was gender-responsive is not described.			
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>			
As this is a real-time evaluation, not all criteria in this review tool are applicable. However there are a few areas where it could more closely align with UNICEF evaluation standards. These include: (i) Clearly describing methods of analysis; (ii) Aligning with good practice by describing UNEG obligations of evaluators and ethical considerations including their application; (iii) Making sure the process for the development of recommendations is described and that recommendations are actionable (i.e., through the use of sub-recommendations); (iv) Providing a dedicated section on conclusions; and (v) Taking up gender in design and methodology of the evaluation. It is recommended that evaluators be provided with the UNICEF evaluation standards and GEROS guidance and encouraged to refer to these documents during the evaluation process to help ensure closer alignment with reporting standards.			

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	Executive summary (weight 5%)	67	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).	Partially	The summary, at close to 5.5 pages, appears useful for key users. However, as the findings extend over 2 pages, it would be helpful if they were organized by criteria or topic.
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	All elements are included except intended audience.
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 summary includes all the necessary information to understand the response under evaluation and does not introduce new material.
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	All elements of the intervention are described, including the ACT-Accelerator, MENA region crisis and response overview.
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-region...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	The main duty bearers are identified as UNICEF, WHO, Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI), and Gavi. It is understood that rights holders are the community at large or the total population of people living across the MENA region.
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 description of the context is adequately provided including challenges such as conflict, forced displacement, recurrent disasters, inflation, collapsing oil prices, political instability, and migration.
ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated	Not Rated	SDGs are not expected to be addressed by this type of evaluation and topic.
iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	Challenges faced by rightsholders are briefly noted by the evaluators in the context section.
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	All key stakeholders including linkages between them are clearly described in section 1 and also presented in Figure 1.
ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The roles and specific contributions of key stakeholders are described.
SECTION C:	Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope (weight 5%)	100	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 purpose of evaluation is clearly described: to produce lessons to improve future COVID-19 response efforts by leveraging the experiences of selected COs and RO during the initial COVAX implementation.
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 specific objectives of the evaluation are clearly stated under section 3.2.

	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 evaluation's thematic, geographic, and chronological scope are clearly described.
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.	Not Rated	Being a real-time evaluation for UNICEF Response to COVID-19, this is not applicable.
	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).	Not Rated	Being a real-time evaluation for UNICEF Response to COVID-19, this is not applicable.
	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	Being a real-time evaluation for UNICEF Response to COVID-19, this is not applicable.
SECTION D:		Evaluation design and methodology (weight 20%)	70	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? 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	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	As per the ToR the evaluation used the following criteria: relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. Cross-cutting issues such as human rights, gender, and equity were also taken up as criteria.
	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 provided in Annex 3 includes questions, sub-questions (lines of inquiry), indicators, data and information sources, and evaluability assessment.
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 RTA is a rapid evaluation using a mixed-methods approach and making use of both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods.
	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 appropriate for the purpose of assessment. They include desk review, key informant interviews (KII) with CO Staff, RO Staff, Government, ACT-A partner agency staff, implementing partners, and frontline workers. A semi-structured survey was also conducted with UNICEF staff, national NGOs, and frontline workers.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	It is noted that KII participants were selected using purposive sampling in consultation with the MENARO Evaluation team and CO focal points.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	No	Methods of analysis are not described.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology is appropriate for drawing causal linkages between the response and possible outcomes related to vaccine preparedness and coverage.
	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	Challenges and mitigation strategies are adequately described. They primarily focused on limited access to information and respondents, as well as national stakeholders' limited knowledge of the ACT-A process.

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	UNEG obligations of evaluators are not described.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	No	There is no description of ethical measures that were implemented by the evaluators.
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.	Not Rated	Being a real-time evaluation, this is not applicable.
SECTION E:	Evaluation findings (weight 25%)	90	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.	Yes	Findings related to all questions are supported by adequate evidence.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Not Rated	This was not an evaluation that analyzed a theory of change but rather the process of response to COVID-19.
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.	Partially	Findings are supported by adequate evidence in the context of the difficult situation and for the purpose of assessing good practice and lessons through a real-time assessment. However, specific data sources are not frequently cited.
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	Findings are based on indicators from the evaluation matrix.
	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 are identified to the extent possible. For example, "in Syria, the CO has been supporting mother groups led by female doctors to increase the female vaccination rate, while in Iraq, vaccination centers provide separate areas for female vaccination. These efforts to increase female vaccination rates have resulted in new partnerships between COs and women's groups."
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.	Yes	This evaluation largely assessed the extent to which government monitoring systems were in place and effective, and presented associated recommendations for supporting development of data systems for monitoring vaccine supply, amongst other M&E needs (Recommendation 4).
SECTION F:	Evaluation conclusions & lessons learned (weight 10%)	75	Comments on Rating

Question 15.	Do the conclusions 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).	Not Rated	Conclusions are not provided, though appeared to be merged with lessons learned, which seems appropriate to the evaluation purpose and approach.
	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.	Not Rated	Conclusions are not provided, though appeared to be merged with lessons learned, which seems appropriate to the evaluation purpose and approach.
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.	Yes	Lessons learned are derived from the findings and appear to have some wider replicability for similar responses in other countries/regions as well as for the RO and COs under review. The lessons are simultaneously specific, drawing on data from the findings, suggesting conclusions and lessons have been merged.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	Lessons are concise yet have adequate information to be useful for their intended audience. However, they are just presented in numbered paragraph form. Usefulness would be improved if the topic area for each lesson was highlighted.
SECTION G:	Recommendations (weight 15%)	63	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	Recommendations are appropriate for the purpose of evaluation and clearly derived from the findings and lessons.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	Recommendations are generally useful though they are sometimes broad and contain limited guidance for their implementation. Clearly actionable recommendations are of particular importance for real-time evaluations.
	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 description of how the recommendations were developed.
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	Recommendations provide the timeframe for their implementation and are directed towards intended users.
SECTION H:	Evaluation structure and presentation (weight 5%)	79	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	Opening pages include all required elements except annexes and list of tables and figures.
	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 are complete and include all required elements.
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 is well structured.

	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.	Partially	The report follows UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports, though merged appeared to have merged conclusions and lessons without clear explanation. It would also be expected to have page numbers.
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.	Yes	At 47 pages, the report is of reasonable length considering its purpose and approach.
	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 free of 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.	Partially	The report includes some visuals, including charts and tables, however sometimes the text is quite small in charts and, overall, the report is quite text-heavy.
SECTION I:	Evaluation principles (weight 10%)		69	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.	No	It would have been useful to reference rights-based frameworks as they relate to crisis response (like the CCC), especially since ethical protocols were not described.
	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	The range of stakeholders participating as respondents is clear, however it is not evident whether there was a group that participated in the review of deliverables which would have been helpful considering this evaluation's formative purpose.
	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	Differential results are presented: For example, it is noted that "In the area covered by the Gaziantep Outpost, 63 percent of the vaccinated population is male. In Iraq, it is estimated that no more than 30 percent of the vaccinated are women." Similarly, evaluators have used appropriate language.
	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 vulnerable groups and hard-to-reach areas were covered, including people with disabilities.
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)			
	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	Gender is integrated into the evaluation purpose, scope, and criteria.
	ii	A gender responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	The report presents some gender disaggregated findings and note there were gender disparities in vaccination rates, but this could not be described due to lack of data. However, descriptions of ethical practices and how the process was gender-responsive were not provided.
	iii	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis	Fully integrated	The background section discusses gender disparities in COVID-19 risk perceptions and vaccine demand, and constrained UN access to national health information. The findings section has a dedicated section covering gender. Similarly, the conclusions and recommendations also reflect gender perspectives.

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?