

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of the UNICEF Cambodia Country Programme 2019-2023

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	83%	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 the UNICEF Cambodia Country Programme 2019-2023		
Report sequence number	Cambodia/60/2022/18522		
Region	EAPR		
Year of report	2022		
Office	UNICEF Cambodia		
Coverage (countries)	Cambodia		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	16/01/2023		
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)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5		
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	Yes		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Evaluation object	Country Programme		
Evaluation type	Summative and formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17		
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>			
<p>This is a thorough evaluation of UNICEF Cambodia Country Programme (CP) 2019-2023. It has a summative and formative purpose. The evaluation employs a theory-based and mixed-methods design. While there is no overarching theory of change (ToC) for the country programme, it uses separate ToCs for the three priority programmes to assess achievements made. Here, more clarity could be made on the components of the ToC that are being assessed and the causal relationships between them. In addition, the report would benefit from a section that identifies the key stakeholders alongside a description of their key roles or contributions. While a list of stakeholders is included in the Annex, the sampling strategy is missing from the Report. Nonetheless, the data sources for this evaluation are extensive. Secondary sources are documented in the Annex and, in addition, the evaluation team interviewed 161 key informants, conducted 7 FGDs, and 5 observations during the data collection phase. The evaluation focuses on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and coherence. The findings section of the report is lengthy – over 50 pages in total (the limit for the report as a whole). The prioritisation of this section has come at a cost to others such as the methodology. The conclusions is clearly articulated. It is sufficiently forward looking as this is, in part, a formative evaluation. The recommendations are aligned with the evaluation purpose. They are clearly articulated and follow logically from the findings, conclusions and lessons.</p>			
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>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SECTION B - Identification of stakeholders and description of role and/or contribution to the programme/s: The evaluation team could consider including a stakeholder map that identifies key actors and their role/connection to the country programmes at the different levels of implementation. This will help lay the groundwork for the sampling strategy in Section D. • SECTION C - Clarity on the components of the ToC that is being assessed across the priority three programmes: While there is no overarching theory of change for the country programme, snapshots of individual ToCs are included in the Annex. It would be helpful if the report could draw out the components from the ToCs that were used as a framework for ToC and contribution analysis, to bring clarity to areas that were being tested and the causal relationships. • SECTION D - Approach and methodology: Overall, evaluators could consider providing more detail on methodology, in the main body or Annex, to allow it to expand on concepts used elsewhere in the report. For example, it refers to contribution analysis and naturalistic inquiry but what they are or how they will be employed is not provided. Similarly, the method for analysis could be strengthened by bringing in more of the detail included in the Inception Report. • SECTION E- Findings section: The structure of the findings section could be improved. As it is lengthy (50 pages in total), a first recommendation is to look at how the content can be prioritised or made more succinct. In addition, as numbering is used in placed of evaluation questions, it would help to include an introductory paragraph for how the section is structured. In addition, introductory paragraphs could be used for sub-sections – particularly where they respond to multiple evaluation questions. 			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	100%	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. It can serve as a standalone document, is concise and follows a clear structure. It meets the maximum 5 page requirement.

	ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	All the elements are included such as context, brief overview of evaluation purpose and methodology. It also includes users of evaluation. It focuses mainly on findings, lessons learned, main conclusions and key 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.	Yes	The summary includes pertinent information needed to understand the country programme and the evaluation. It does not introduce new information.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			79%	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 report provides a clear overview of the Country Programme including the key programmatic areas, delivery structure and operational areas/location. It describes the timelines, budget and implementation status. This is further elaborated on in Annex 3.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cites, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	The background section provides a brief description of duty bearers and the intended rightsholders/beneficiaries. This is covered in greater length in the Annex according to key programme areas.
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	There is a thorough description and context analysis within the main body of the report with more detail provided in the Annex. While the focus is mainly on the socio-economic context, it provides a foundation to understand the country programme's key areas/pillars.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	The context section, within the Annex, includes a figure of the SDGs that UNICEF contributes to. Evaluators could further contextualise it to Cambodia and to the priority country programmes. The findings section includes an assessment of UNICEF's contribution to SDGs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The status and needs of rightsholders/beneficiaries is described in the main report and Annex. This includes poverty level, educational attainment, WASH access, health and nutrition (in relation to the key programmes).
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).	Partially	Rights-holders/beneficiaries and key partners are identified in the context section of the Annex. Given the scope of the evaluation and the different actors involved, evaluators could consider including a stakeholder map that identifies key actors and their role/connection to the country programmes at the different levels of implementation. This will help lay the groundwork for the sampling strategy in the next section.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	While key stakeholders are identified, mainly in the Annex, it does not include descriptions of their contributions or roles in a systematic or coherent way. It would be good to better understand the roles and contribution of the key stakeholders at the different levels (i.e. national, sub-national, community etc.)
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			75%	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 the evaluation is clearly described in the executive summary and again in the main body of the report. This includes the timing for the evaluation and its summative and formative purpose. It also includes the key intended users.
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 objectives of the evaluation are provided in the main body of the report. There are no departures from the ToRs.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Partially	This section provides a brief overview of the scope of the evaluation, timeframe, evaluation use and cross-cutting themes integrated into evaluation. It would be helpful to include what would not be in the scope and the rationale such as the timeframe for the evaluation, priority programmes, geographic areas and so on.
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	There is no overarching theory of change for the country programme, which the evaluation notes as a limitation. It includes snapshots of individual theory of change for the three priority programmes in the Annex. It would be helpful if the report could draw out the components from the ToCs that were used as a framework for ToC and contribution analysis, to bring clarity to areas that were being tested.

	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 findings section includes a narrative of the achievements against outcomes and outputs. As above it would be helpful to describe, in narrative or graphic form, the outcomes and outputs that will be assessed. The ToC snapshot in the Annex do not easily match the findings in the main report, making it difficult to follow the logic and causal relationships.
	iii For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Yes	The findings section assesses the higher-level results using individual ToCs of the three priority programmes.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	82%	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 focuses on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and coherence. The latter criterion on coherence was included by the evaluation team and documented in the Inception Report. It also include cross-cutting focus on equity, human rights, gender equality and disability. The evaluation questions and sub-questions seem appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation.
	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 report includes a detailed evaluation framework in the Annex. This organises the evaluation questions by the relevant criteria with indicators identified for each EQ. It also includes corresponding columns for data sources, data collection and analysis methods.
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.	Partially	The evaluation employs a theory-based and mixed-methods design, which is appropriate for the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. It could provide more detail on methodology, in the main body or Annex, to allow it to expand on concepts used elsewhere in the report. For example, it refers to contribution analysis and naturalistic inquiry but what they are or how they will be employed is not provided. These approaches are elaborated on in the Inception Report and this narrative could be brought into the Report.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The data sources used in this evaluation are extensive. It includes a comprehensive list of secondary sources in the Annex. They are wide-ranging and include programme documentation, policies, annual reports as well as evaluations, research articles, and quantitative and qualitative data to inform indicators. The evaluation team interviewed 161 key informants, conducted 7 FGDs, and 5 observations during the data collection phase.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	There is no sampling strategy provided in either the main body or Annex of the report. There is a sampling strategy available in the Inception Report that could be brought into the main report or Annexes.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	The report provides a brief description of the methods of analysis. This can be strengthened by bringing in more of the detail outlined in the Inception Report, either in the main body or by signposting to the Annex. However, the report does include an evaluation matrix which an overarching framework for the analysis.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for causal connections to be drawn. This is further evidenced in the findings section that looks specifically at the achievement of sector level results in health and nutrition, WASH and education.
	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	Limitations are described in the main report alongside mitigation efforts.

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).	Yes	There is explicit references made to UNEG principles and adherences to UNEG norms and standards and 2007 UNEG Ethical Guidelines. It obtained Ethical Clearance from the Ethics Review Board (ERB). The letter is included in the Annex.
	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	There is reference of compliance with UNEG Code of Conduct and the principle of 'do no harm'. It describes how gender considerations were integrated into the report and mentions maintaining neutrality, impartiality, and independence in its findings and recommendations. However, while children and adolescents were not interviewed, there were five site observations involving schools and health centres. If this involved children, it would be important that explicit reference is made.
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.	Partially	Under sub-section on evaluation use, the report describes setting up an independent platform for stakeholders to register their suggestions. This then led to recommendations for programme design or implementation. While it does not give much detail for how it was implemented, it is an intriguing idea for making the recommendation process more inclusive.
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.	Partially	It is difficult to assess as the findings are not entirely structured according to the evaluation questions, sub-questions and criteria. This requires the reader to go between the evaluation matrix and the findings section to understand what the questions the sub-section's are answering. It would be helpful if the introduction includes a section that describes the structure. The sub-sections could also include an introductory paragraph outlining what aspects of the EQs are being addressed, particularly where different EQs are grouped together.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	It is evident that the evaluation used the ToC of the three priority programmes.
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.	Yes	The evaluation made use of both qualitative and quantitative data. Secondary sources are frequently cited. 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.	Partially	The findings are supported by the evidence provided. This can be strengthened by clear references in the findings to judgement criteria in the evaluation matrix. This is the case in some sub-sections but it is not consistent.
	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	The evaluation identifies the lack of overarching ToC as a limitation. However, it assesses the achievements or non-achievements of results specifically to address the three priority programmes using individual ToC.
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	There is evidence within the findings relating to different programme's monitoring systems, at different levels of intervention. However, this is not explicitly or systematically addressed.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	100%	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 clearly articulated. They are structured by the four main criteria relevance, convergence, effectiveness and sustainability. The latter two summarises the three priority programmes. It is sufficiently forward looking as this is, in part, a formative 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.	Yes	Conclusions are carefully derived including both the strengths and weaknesses of the country programme including those of the priority programmatic interventions.
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	The lessons emerge logically from the conclusion section. They have wider applicability - some identified in the section itself.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are concisely presented but with enough detail for intended audiences.

SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		88%	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 are aligned with the evaluation purpose. They are clearly articulated and follow logically from the findings, conclusions and lessons. There are 7 main recommendations and 21 sub/operational recommendations. However, given the scope of the evaluation and the different programmatic areas (2-4 operational recommendations for each recommendation) is acceptable.
ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	As mentioned above, each main recommendation is supported by operational recommendations. They are clear with practical steps to take forward.
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 section on recommendation refers to consultation with key national stakeholders and development partners but does not specify who they were. It does not mention rights holders or an explanation about their involvement or otherwise.
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 are directed at a high-level i.e. UNICEF's CO. A timeline is provided for each of the seven recommendations as order of priority.
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.	Yes	All required elements are included in the opening pages.
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	Annexes include most of the requirements. It could be strengthened with the inclusion of further details on methodology such as sampling strategy and data analysis.
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).	Partially	The contents page was very helpful in navigating the report. There are clear numbered paragraphs although differentiating section headings and sub-sections through formatting (font sizes or section numbering) would make it easier. The findings section is quite long (over 50 pages) and it would help to include introductory paragraphs for sub-sections, particularly as findings were not strictly structured according to evaluation questions and the questions themselves were numbered rather than written out.
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 order followed 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 ToR specify a limit of 50 pages not including the executive summary and annexes. The total length of this report is 73 pages.
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 written in a way that is easy to understand.
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 is text heavy and, in parts, quite dense. This can be broken by through shorter paragraphs and formatting to aid the reader. The use of summary headings or introductory paragraphs would be helpful to break down lengthy sections. Where tables or diagrams are used, these are clearly presented, labelled and referenced in the text.
SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)		88%	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 makes reference to CEDAW and consulted a number of CRC documents, as see in their bibliography. It also mentions integrating a gender, human rights, equity, equality and disability in the design section of the evaluation.
ii	Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	The evaluations involves duty bearers, at various levels, during the data collection stage and some in setting out the recommendations. FGDs were held with beneficiaries including parents and community members. According to the ToRs, a reference group would be established to review evaluation products and guide the evaluation at different stages.

	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 language of the report is appropriate. However, data presented is not sufficiently disaggregated, particularly in the findings section that assess achievements made. However, the analysis discusses some of the disparities between gender or marginalised groups.
	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	Child's rights, gender and disability assessments are evident throughout the report.
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)	8	
	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	GEEW is integrated at various stages of the evaluation including in the data collection and analysis. The Inception Report refers to guidance from UNSWAP to inform evaluation design and ensure gender considerations in the evaluation.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation refers to gender considerations in the design and assessment of results. It could make more explicit the measures it has taken to ensure the data collection and analysis process is gender-sensitive.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>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>