GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of UNICEF's coverage and quality in complex humanitarian situations: Nigeria

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		**81%**	**Satisfactory**
● ● ● ● ●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
● ● ● ●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
● ● ● -	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	**3**	**Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence**
● ● - -	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
● - - -	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	

REPORT DETAILS	
Title of the evaluation report	Evaluation of UNICEF's coverage and quality in complex humanitarian situations: Nigeria
Report sequence number	Nigeria/61/2021/18528
Region	WCAR
Year of report	2021
Office	Evaluation Office
Coverage (countries)	Nigeria
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	02/06/2022
Name of review firm	DeftEdge
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	Yes
Every child learns	Yes
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	No
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	No
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes
Evaluation object	Thematic area
Evaluation type	Formative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design *(primary method used)*	Non-experimental
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome
Geographic scope	National
Primary SDG(s) covered *(number)*	Not specified.

EQA Summary:

Overall, this is a high-quality evaluation that can be used by decision-makers to inform UNICEF's humanitarian response in north-east Nigeria and beyond. The evaluation design uses a strong methodological approach that drew on mixed-methods to collect qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation team successfully consulted with hundreds of individuals across multiple stakeholder groups, including community groups, generating a robust evidence base. In addition, the evaluation used particularly innovative data collection methodologies to gather data on results, including the use of the U-Report, an online platform that was used to collect direct feedback from nearly 3,000 beneficiaries. The findings are supported by robust evidence, provide a balanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses, and are effective at presenting the nuanced perspectives of multiple groups of stakeholders. Findings also make strong use of benchmarks outlined in the UNICEF Core Commitments for Children (CCC), which represents good practice for measuring UNICEF's performance in humanitarian settings. However, the findings would have been better contextualized if the context section had provided a more complete overview of UNICEF's response to the humanitarian crisis in northeast Nigeria. In addition, the evaluation is not fully gender-responsive as it does not adequately reflect gender issues in the context, conclusions and recommendations. Even so, the evaluation provides strong conclusions and recommendations. However, recommendations are not prioritized. Finally, even though the evaluation seeks to identify good practices and lessons learned to inform UNICEF's humanitarian response, the report does not include a section on lessons learned.

Recommendations for Improvement:

For future evaluations, it would be helpful for the evaluators to present a complete stakeholder mapping clearly identifying the rights holders and duty bearers, and their role in implementation. This would also include a more detailed overview of the roles and responsibilities of UNICEF in the humanitarian response. In addition, considering that evaluation users may not have all of the resources necessary to implement all recommendations at once, it is normally good practice to identify those that are most urgent, even though all of them appear to be equally important to generate improvements. Likewise, the evaluation report could also be improved by including a separate section on lessons learned. Furthermore, future evaluation reports could explain whether the evaluation used a participatory process to develop the recommendations. To ensure that these details are included in the report, the evaluation manager could consider sharing with the evaluation team the GEROS criteria. Finally, useful resources on gender mainstreaming in evaluations include the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations (2014), particularly Chapter 7 Conduct/Implementation of an HR & GE Responsive Evaluation.

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 executive summary is clearly presented and serves as a useful document to inform decision-making. However, at 6 pages, the length of the executive summary slightly exceeds UNICEF requirements.
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 most of the required elements. However, it does not specify the 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 executive summary summarizes well key messages presented in the evaluation report and does not introduce new information.
SECTION B:	**BACKGROUND (weight 5%)**	86%	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 context section provides information on the location of the intervention and timeline of UNICEF's L2/L3 activation protocols, and a good description of the overall humanitarian response.
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	Table 5 provides a clear overview of the 'people in need' and 'people targeted' by the yearly humanitarian response plan (HRP) over the assessed period. Figure 3 also presents the number of children beneficiaries targeted and reached by UNICEF per sector.
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 report describes well the humanitarian crisis in north-east Nigeria between 2015 and 2020. In doing so, it presents a general overview of the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and of the Government's response to the crisis.
ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	The report does not make explicit linkages to the SDGs because it focuses on humanitarian action. The report does, however, make explicit reference to commitments made by UNICEF at the World Humanitarian Summit and the Grand Bargain.
iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The context section provides a complete description of the status and needs of the population affected by the conflict in Nigeria, including youth.
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	The context section clearly presents Government stakeholders (i.e. duty bearers), but it could have provided a more complete description of rights holders (although Figure 3 does present the number of targeted beneficiaries, it could further elaborate on who these children are). In addition, the context section does not clearly identify implementing agencies or development partners. However, this information is presented in the findings (see Section 4.3 on partnerships).
ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	The context section provides general information (including financial) on the overall humanitarian response plan (HRP). However, it does not specify the contribution and roles of specific stakeholders in the response - aside from that of the Government. The context also provides little information on UNICEF's response - this can be gleaned from Figure 3 although the typeface is very small. A few sentences on UNICEF's work would be helpful for situating the evaluation.
SECTION C:	**EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)**	90%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose of the evaluation is clearly described. In 2018, the UNICEF EO commissioned an evaluation of UNICEF's coverage and quality in complex humanitarian situations, of which Nigeria was a country case study. The Nigeria case study provided a set of recommendations, and the present evaluation updates and expands on this case study. The intended audience and expected uses are clearly outlined.
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 clearly stated and consistent with those identified in the ToR. They are in line with the evaluation purpose to provide insights for improving the coverage and quality of UNICEF's humanitarian response in north-east Nigeria.
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 temporal, geographic and thematic 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.	Yes	Figure 3 presents the type of results expected across the 5 sectors drawing on benchmarks from the CCC.
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	Linkages between outputs and outcomes are not clearly depicted in the introductory sections - although these linkages are discussed later in the findings.
iii	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Not Rated	This is not a theory-based evaluation and is therefore not applicable.
SECTION D:	**EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)**	95%	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	The report clearly identifies the evaluation questions and sub-questions, which are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation questions do implicitly address traditional OECD-DAC criteria and humanitarian criteria such as coverage and connectedness. However, the evaluation report acknowledges that the evaluation framework was not structured around the OECD-DAC criteria as "it was not designed this way". However, at the request of the Nigeria CO to address UNICEF standards, the evaluation presents a summary of findings structured along the criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and sustainability in Conclusions (see Table 6).
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	An evaluation matrix is included in the annexes. The matrix is structured along the evaluation questions and subquestions, and also includes a series of indicators to guide the analysis.
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 data collection methods are clearly outlined and are relevant to achieve the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Data collection methods include: 1) document and literature review; 2) semi-structured key informant interviews; 3) Community engagement and focus group discussions; 4) Humanitarian coverage and quality assessment; 5) U-Report text-message poll among beneficiaries of UNICEF humanitarian assistance.
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	Quantitative and qualitative data sources are clearly outlined. Quantitative data was extracted from SitReps and a U-Report text-message poll. Qualitative data sources provide an adequate representation of stakeholder groups. These are: UNICEF staff, UNICEF implementing partners (NGOs and Government), other UN agencies; donors; community members. Overall, 130 individuals were consulted through KIIs and 173 community members through FGDs.
iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The sampling approach for quantitative data collection through the U-Report is clearly outlined. However, the sampling approach for qualitative data collection is less clear. While the total number of consulted beneficiaries per region is identified, it is not clear how representative of the total population per sector they represent.
iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The four-step process used from the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data is presented in Figure 2.
v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	As noted above, the methodology makes strong use of the CCCs and its benchmarks. For humanitarian evaluation, this represents an appropriate methodology to examine UNICEF's contribution to outcomes.
vi	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	The report clearly identifies limitations and corresponding mitigation strategies.
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	The evaluation makes explicit reference to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations Systems, and the obligations of evaluators.
ii	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	The report clearly describes ethical safeguards, including issues of informed consent, confidentiality and safe data storage. Data collection involved adolescents and the report explicitly mentions the UNICEF guidance on Ethical Research Involving Children.
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.	Yes	The evaluation used two particularly innovative data collection methods. Firstly, it developed a tool to generate qualitative and quantitative data on UNICEF's performance from SitReps, which it then validated with UNICEF staff during the country missions. Secondly, it used the U-Report, a text messaging platform and data collection mechanism developed by UNICEF, to obtain direct feedback from nearly 3,000 beneficiaries.
SECTION E:	**EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)**	100%	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	The findings answer all evaluation questions and sub-questions with sufficient depth.
ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	Section 3.1.1 presents a clear assessment of UNICEF's humanitarian coverage against established targets. In addition, Figure 3 provides an overview of targeted vs. reached beneficiaries across five sectors between 2018-2020.
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	Findings are supported by a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. The findings are strong at presenting the nuanced perspectives of stakeholder groups and consistently reference data sources, which makes it easy for the reader to understand how the data was triangulated.
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	The findings are supported by robust evidence and provide a balanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of UNICEF's humanitarian response in Nigeria. In addition, to measure the quality of UNICEF's humanitarian response, the findings draw on benchmarks set out in its Core Commitments for Children (CCC) in complex high-threat environments (CHTEs).
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	Internal and external factors enabling and hindering the achievement of results are thoroughly discussed.
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	The evaluation provides an assessment of humanitarian performance monitoring (HPM) and programmatic monitoring visits (PMV), and the extent to which these have been used to inform decision-making and course correction.
SECTION F:	**EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)**	50%	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 formulated, analytical, and provide a forward-looking analysis of the implications on the findings for the future of UNICEF's humanitarian response.
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 logically derive from the findings, present a balanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of UNICEF's humanitarian response in Nigeria, and add insights 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 evaluation does not include a separate section on lessons learned. A few lessons are embedded in the findings, though these cannot be distinguished easily. Considering that EQ1 seeks to identify good practices and lessons to inform improvements across UNICEF's response in complex humanitarian situations, a separate section on lessons learned could have added considerable value to the evaluation.
ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	As noted above, a section on lessons learned is not included.
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 logically derive from the findings and conclusions and clearly align with the evaluation purpose.
ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are useful and propose a set of specific actions to guide their implementation.
iii	Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	No	The report does not describe the process used for developing recommendations.
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.	Partially	Each recommendation is clearly targeted at specific functions within the Nigeria CO/field offices. The evaluation proposes 12 recommendations, which are not prioritized because they are deemed of "equal priority". Even so, considering that the country office may not have the resources to implement all recommendations at once, it is important for these to be prioritized, especially given the high number of recommendations.
SECTION H:	**REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)**	93%	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 includes all of the required information.

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	The annexes include the majority of the required elements. However, data collection tools are missing.
Question 20.	Is the report logically structured?		
i	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The structure is easy to navigate. The report is well formatted and includes numbered sections with clear titles and sub-titles.
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 report is logically structured, in accordance with UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports.
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 77 pages excluding annexes and the executive summary, the evaluation report is within length requirements. The ToR do not specify a maximum number of pages for the report.
ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is well written and easy to understand. It uses key statements in bold throughout the findings, which helps the reader to quickly understand the main messages. The report is free from spelling and grammar errors.
iii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report uses multiples visual aids (i.e., figures, tables, infographics, maps) to convey key information effectively.
SECTION I:	**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)**	62%	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 is strongly anchored in UNICEF's CCC. In addition, one of the evaluation's three objectives is to "identify internal and external enabling factors and challenges to UNICEF's fulfillment of its protection mandate and role in complex humanitarian situations, including its designated role in the MRM [monitoring and reporting mechanism] resulting from United Nations Security Council resolutions on Children Affected by Armed Conflict".
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 methodology provides a clear description of the level of participation of rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation. The report also describes the level of involvement of the reference group.
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 evaluation makes frequent reference to accountability to affected populations (AAP) and therefore uses a rights-based terminology. However, the evaluation does not use the terms 'rights holders' and 'duty bearers', and instead makes frequent use of the word 'beneficiaries'.
iv	Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Partially	The evaluation assesses programme coverage, which includes coverage of vulnerable groups. Persons living with disabilities are identified in the analytical framework as part of vulnerable groups, and disability is also included in an indicator of the evaluation matrix. Yet, the issue of disability is not discussed in the findings.
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)	4	
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	Gender equality is not mentioned in the evaluation purpose or objectives, nor is there a separate criterion on gender equality and human rights. However, gender is integrated in some of the evaluation sub-questions and indicators.
ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	Data on FGD participants is disaggregated by age and sex. However, the report does not specify whether the evaluation adopted a gender-responsive methodology.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	A gender analysis is integrated in the findings. However, the perspective of beneficiaries is presented as a whole and the voices of women and men are not clearly conveyed. Furthermore, the context section, conclusions and recommendations do not reflect on gender issues.

SWAP Rating Guidance

i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.

a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?
b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?

	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations? c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis. a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?