

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Summative Evaluation of UNICEF DRC Multisectoral approach to public health emergence

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		53%	Fair
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●●●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
●●●●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may use the evaluation with caution. Substantive improvements in some areas are needed
●●●●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report	Summative Evaluation of UNICEF DRC Multisectoral approach to public health emergence		
Report sequence number	Democratic Republic of Congo/61/2022/18706		
Region	WCAR		
Year of report	2022		
Office	UNICEF CO DRC		
Coverage (countries)	Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	January 14, 2023		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	UNICEF managed		
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives	Yes		
Every child learns	No		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	No		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Evaluation object	Joint Programme		
Evaluation type	Summative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Non-experimental		
Evaluation level	Impact		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	3, 5, 6, 10		
EQA Summary: 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.			
<p>This report evaluates a complex multisectoral approach to Public Health Emergencies in three provinces of DRC. The response to five different diseases (Ebola, Cholera, Measles, Plague and Covid 19), occurred in a challenging operating context particularly in relation to conflict, poor infrastructure, and ongoing public health emergencies. The evaluation faced some of the same challenges, and the report could have been more explicit in situating the approach to undertaking an evaluation in such challenging contexts. There is detail of the impact and adaptations due to COVID 19, and the evaluation team does seem to have adapted well to protect both those collecting data, and those providing data, however, ongoing armed conflict and other issues which may have impacted on the intervention, or the evaluation, are more briefly mentioned. The methodology demonstrates good use of mixed methods, and the evaluation questions are appropriate to meet the purpose with a thorough evaluation matrix setting out criteria, questions and sub questions (provided as an Annex). However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is lack of detail on how specific methods were applied, for example a participatory approach was proposed, but there was there no evidence to suggest that the evaluation had been guided by participants, especially rights holders/ beneficiaries. A contribution analysis approach was also outlined, but little detail of how it would be applied in practice. •Research ethics are not given appropriate consideration, and even though there were Focus Group Discussions held with youths aged 14-19 there is no mention of the UNICEF Guidelines on Research with Children. •Gender is considered only from a basic perspective, i.e. to ensure than men and women were equally included in interviews and focus groups, there was also little mention of any other vulnerable groups, and how their voices may have been included, and integrated, throughout the report, for example integration of a HRBA or other approaches. <p>The findings section uses data appropriately, and evidence from UNICEF (and other partners) monitoring is clearly identified, however, it is less clear how the qualitative data was integrated into the findings, and a participatory approach taken to data collection or analysis. There was very little on triangulation of data, or contribution analysis, and no reference back to the theory of change/ logic framework in the discussion of the findings. Some question were not addressed fully, particularly relating to needs broken down by gender, or vulnerable groups, which relates to the issues outlined above with regard to the methodology. There was, however, good analysis of the quantitative data from the Household Survey to demonstrate how knowledge in local communities had been increased in terms of preventing, identifying and treating different diseases. The conclusions do (for the most part) follow logically from the findings, but suffer from some of the same failings such as lack of integration of GEEW considerations. The lessons learned unfortunately introduce some new terminologies and refer to approaches not previously mentioned directly (for example a health zone approach). The recommendations are clear, but like earlier sections treat GEEW as a standalone element, and do not explain in detail how the recommendations were developed and in particular the roles of rights bearers and duty holders. They are categorised and prioritised, but do not identify what (if any) parts of the recommendations have already been implemented (or continued) since the end of the evaluation time scale (2020) and the writing of the evaluation in 2022.</p>			
Recommendations for Improvement: 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.			

Background and Context

- More relevant and comparable data on recent disease outbreaks should be included in the context section, with less of a focus on historical disease incidences.
- A copy of the most recent Strategic Response Plan (SRP4) should be summarised in the main report and included in the annex, with the adaptations from earlier SRPs to the final SRP4 better explained, including the outcomes from a multisectoral meeting in 2019 to learn from SRPs 1-3 and develop SRP4.
- The coordination of the multisectoral plan and details of the different pillars should be explained in the main report, and complimented by a stakeholder map.
- There should be reference to SDGs

Methodology

- More attention should be paid to ethics in research design, particularly with regard to accessing vulnerable groups and integrating GEEW at every stage of the evaluation.
- As Focus Group Discussions included young people from 14-19 years of age there should be clear reference to UNICEF's procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.
- More detail on how a participatory approach will be applied in practice would have aided in its application.

Findings

- All parts of a questions should be answered, or a reason given as to why not, e.g. the section of EQ1 relating to identifying needs of women and children is not addressed.
- A GEEW approach should to be taken to analysis of findings, and more specific detail given on how qualitative data from interviews and Focus Group Discussions were used in the findings, to ensure that the voice of communities (and different groups within communities) is clearly identified, analysed and utilised.
- The ToC should be tested or referenced during the analysis of findings.

Recommendations

- More detail on how the recommendations were developed and in particular the roles of rights bearers and duty holders, as well as more detail on partners role in implementation.
- Identify what (if any) parts of the recommendations have been implemented, or continued, since 2020.

Evaluation Principles

- Human Rights Based Approaches are a criteria of the evaluation, should be referenced either as a framework or benchmark for the design of the evaluation.
- The Evaluation should reference and assesses the extent to which the intervention addressed child rights and Leave No-one Behind.

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).	Yes	The Executive Summary is a concise (less than 5 pages) summary of the full report. It can be used as a standalone document for decision making purposes, taking into account the recommendations for improvement of the report overall.
	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 contains almost all of necessary sections, however, it could be improved if the intended audiences were noted, and more detail provided on objectives and usage by different audiences.
	iii Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Partially	The executive summary is clearly set out and includes a summary of most information in the main report, however, more detail on who the multi sectoral partners are, and the specific interventions carried out by UNICEF, and other partners would be useful to aid understanding of the intervention. This could be in the form of a foot note link or reference to where this information could be found in the Executive Summary itself to ensure it is a standalone document. No new information is presented in the Executive Summary.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	64%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	Yes, except with regard to some data which the evaluation team are not in control of, and as such was not available to them particularly with regard to baseline data and financial data.
	ii Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	This question was answered in part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a description of rights holders, but at a high level (essentially all people in the geographic area who could contract any of the listed diseases, or receive awareness raising, or direct support). • Duty bearers were primarily listed as central government (Ministry of Public Health), with mention of provincial health authorities, but no distinction of responsibilities. The Ministry of Health is mentioned as a co-chair of the Strategic Committee, but no explanation of the role of this committee, or links to appendices which do contain some further detail on this topic is provided. • Geographic locations are listed, and map provided, but only to province level • Non state actors are listed as being implementing partners, but with little detail on their responsibilities except that they will support UNICEF - appendices do list partners, but not their individual roles, which would aid understanding if included. • Table 1.5 contains estimated beneficiaries, which covers those who have contracted specific diseases, as well as the entire population who could potentially benefit from awareness raising and prevention activities. There is no disaggregation by gender or age.
Question 3.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		

	i Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Partially	There is a country context which is clear and makes links to the political context, particularly decades of armed conflict, and how this links to the reasons that the interventions on public health emergencies are needed, and why a multisectoral approach was implemented. More detail could have been provided on how this directly relates to the intervention, geographically or culturally. The choices over what information to include in the main report with regard to understanding the Public Health context is difficult to follow, for example there is a historical data referring to outbreaks of cholera and plague in 1852 and 1894 respectively - information that might be more suited an annex. While table 1.1 on historical data on key diseases lacks comparable data either in terms of geography or time scale. While the data in Box 1 which sets out information on the 5 main diseases included in this multisectoral approach (Ebola, Cholera, Measles, Plague and COVID 19) is not consistent or comparable across the different diseases.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Not explicitly mentioned but it can be assumed, given the focus of the evaluation, that it will contribute to goals, 3,5,6 and 10.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The status and needs of rightsholders/ beneficiaries is provided at a high level only in terms of understanding general statistics on childhood mortality, morbidity and malnutrition, as well as the impact of armed conflict on people's ability to access health care. The needs of different rightsholders/ beneficiaries is not clearly described, but detail is provided on how different elements of the intervention will support communities in general.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i Identification of implementing agency(is), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Partially	A list of all stakeholders, which includes duty bearers, implementing partners and other organisations in the multisectoral partnership is provided at Appendix 4. There is summary of this table in the main body of the report, which does includes a short reference to rights holders (table 2.1). This section could be improved if: •There was a stakeholder map illustrating more clearly how different stakeholders related to each other •There was more detail on rights holders as stakeholders, perhaps by explaining how the community groups (CACs) were set up, and how they interacted with UNICEF and other partners.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	The main report has a brief outline of the roles of key stakeholders (table 2.1), with more detail in Appendix 4. The roles of rights holders could be described in more detail. There is a lack of financial data, but this was not made available to the evaluation team, excepting UNICEF data.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	67%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
	i Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The purpose is clearly defined, as well its intended use and key intended users (set out in table 2.1).
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
	i Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Partially	This is a short section, which outlines 5 evaluation objectives, which are drawn from the TOR. It would be improved if a more descriptive response was provided illustrating what will be achieved, if the objectives are achieved.

	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	<p>The scope is defined at a high level from a geographic, thematic and chronological perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Geographically - it would be good to know if there are there any sub regions or areas of each provinces which will be considered as more core/ key to the approach, or the site of activities/ interventions. Additionally the impact of conflict on activities and management of disease outbreaks would have been expected to be discussed here - details of any areas which were inaccessible or hard to reach due to safety, or other issues would be useful to highlight. •Chronologically - the time period of the evaluation is defined as being backwards looking (summative) to the period of 2018-2020. While this is accurate, the TOR, and the report itself make reference to the fact that activities continued beyond this time period, and the report makes reference to plans and activities that ran into 2021 and beyond. A brief explanation of this would add clarity, and also allow an understanding of where the evaluation is situated in time, given that disease outbreaks continued after 2020, as did UNICEFs work. •Thematically - the evaluation questions are clearly set out, along with the strategic activities which UNICEF was responsible for delivering.
Question 7.		Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well-articulated?		
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Partially	The intended results are articulated, but where they sit in the results/ logic chain is not defined, nor is it clear which are specifically being tested by the evaluation.
	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	A ToC is presented (figure 1,4) and does include a graphical representation of the activities, through to outcomes and impact. An evaluation matrix is included in the appendices. This section could be strengthened by a narrative to explain how the relationships between the different elements of the ToC influence/ underpin each other.
	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 ToC was developed at inception stage, where the IR stated it would be revised if necessary during the actual evaluation. This does not appear to have occurred, it is therefore assumed that revisions were not considered necessary, and the ToC is usefully included in the main report.
SECTION D:		EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	59%	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 evaluation questions are appropriate to meet the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are clearly set out and aligned with the questions.
	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.	Partially	The evaluation matrix sets out indicators and sources of data, both of which are robust. It could be improved if assumptions and opportunities for benchmarking included (comparative studies are listed in the evaluation matrix, but it is unclear what this means, and they are not referenced elsewhere in the report or the appendices).
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	<p>The design approach is classed as a mix of theory based and participatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The theory based element is well explained, and relates to the purpose and objectives, although it is not applied as anticipated. •The participatory approach is not well explained, nor evidenced, which is unfortunate as a participatory approach to inform the evaluation design and activities, would have been beneficial, particularly to enable the voices of rights holders and beneficiaries to be at the heart of the process. <p>The design also had two sub elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution analysis which is not well explained, more detail on how this method will practically be applied, rather than simply stating it will be applied would have been helpful. • Pre-post single group test design - which is explained and is appropriate given that the use of two groups of individuals/ communities to gather data would be unethical in a health emergency response setting, as well as methodologically challenging to attempt to undertake retrospectively (if ethics allowed).

	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Partially	Data sources are appropriate, and include qualitative and quantitative sources, but not all are clearly described, for example: •The desk based review states that over 600 documents were reviewed, and these are listed in the appendix, however, given the high number of documents more detail on how they were categorised, and how different document were analysed, or identified as key, would be useful to include here. •Field photographs are included as a data source and included in the appendices, however, their purpose and usage is not defined. It is also noted that field observations will occur but there is not further mention of whether this occurred, or why it was included. •More detail could have been provided on how participants were identified to take part in Focus Group Discussions, with specific reference to gender, equity and human rights.
	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 strategy for the quantitative data (Household survey) is sound methodologically, and clearly explained. The sampling strategy for qualitative data, i.e. identifying stakeholders to take part in interviews and focus group discussion is much less clearly defined. In particular how people in local communities were identified would be useful to include here. How diverse perspectives were to be captured is not well explained or explored, nor are reasons for this provided.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	Some methods of analysis are clearly described, for example the Household Survey data. Others particularly relating to participatory engagement and contribution analysis could be described in more detail, and from a GEEW and HRBA perspective
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	If applied as intended, yes. However, the evaluation does not use the term output, but does discuss interventions and outcomes - more clarity could be provided on the terminology used, and why.
	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).	Partially	Three limitations are noted, and are appropriate - they relate to gaps in data, challenge in reaching certain geographic areas, and availability (or not) of stakeholders. It might be expected that additional limitations, or constraints would exist, but have not been included here, for example that further Ebola outbreaks specifically may restrict travel, that consultants or locally employed field monitoring staff might be unable to undertake expected work. There is no mention of mitigation of bias, or identifying innovative ways to address data gaps, such as the use of grey literature.
Question 10.		Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Partially	The evaluation is explicit in referring to and explaining how the evaluators will comply with the UNEG obligations, however, these could be better contextualised, and referred to throughout the evaluation, not only in paragraph 3.6. Additionally in stating how evaluators will meet certain obligations, such as credibility, it is stated this will be through inclusive and participatory process, and triangulation of different data sources, but there is scant evidence this actually occurred. Being more explicit throughout the evaluation about these factors would strengthen this section, and the evaluation overall.
	ii	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Partially	Ethical approval for the fieldwork elements of the evaluation was obtained from the University of Kinshasa, however, there was little mention of ethics and ethical safeguards appropriate to the methodology. There is no mention of UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children, even though it is stated that focus groups were conducted with "adult men and women, including adolescents (14 -19 years)" pp13.
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	If participatory approaches were applied and evidenced they could have resulted in innovative and people-led data, it does not however appear that this occurred. However, the use of technology to conduct interviews and surveys, and the adaptation to COVID 19 restrictions and safety measures illustrated and adaptive and open approach to data collection in challenging circumstances.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)		50%	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	<p>The questions were answered systematically and addressed almost every criteria and question, but with some gaps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •EQ1 on Relevance asks whether UNICEF's response was relevant to "local behavioural patterns of most affected people (in particular women and children)". However, the findings section for EQ1 contained no reference to women and children, and no explanation as to why not (was data not able to be gathered or disaggregated?). • Lack of data on Efficiency, but reasons for this are outlined as lack of data available to the evaluation team. This makes sense in terms of efficiency, where financial and human resource data was not equally available from all partners, and primary based on UNICEF data, so gaps are understandable. • Gender equality Equity and HRBA - there is limited data available on some of these issues, some of it not available to the team at the outset, such as disaggregated data, but the findings on these topics could be improved if there was more evidence of how the data gaps were addressed/ mitigated, and how these GEEW and HRBA was mainstreamed across the evaluation. <p>On several criteria if additional information were provide it would be helpful, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On sustainability there is multiple references to a 90 day sustainability plan, but a copy of it is not provided (in the report or the annexes). • On Coordination there is no clear outline in the report of what the coordination mechanisms are, some of this is provided in the annex, but it would be more appropriate to bring into the main report to aid in understanding and analysis.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	No	There is no results framework, and the theory of change outlined in the context section is not referenced in the evaluation findings section.
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	<p>The evaluation does use credible forms of quantitative information, for example UNICEF monitoring data is used to analyse outcome level data to analyse whether UNICEF achieved its objectives under the pillars of activity it was responsible for (table 4.1). The use of the Household Survey data is also good, and is particularly well used in demonstrating awareness of households in relation to prevention, identification and treatment of different diseases (see figures 4.5 and 4.6).</p> <p>The qualitative data is less well utilised, with very little use of direct quotes from community level focus groups of KIIs (text box on pp34), and the voice of communities was not consistently presented. The qualitative data is also not aligned with, or used to test the quantitative data, and although the methodology states that data triangulation will occur there is scant evidence of whether this occurred. The voices of vulnerable groups was mentioned briefly, but not consistently analysed, or applied to the findings.</p> <p>There is a good use of summary boxes to reflect key points</p>
	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	<p>Findings do reflect the evidence, both positive and negative, and in some cases is clear about where the evidence was derived, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Clear use of UNICEF performance indicators at outcome level, particularly in response to questions around Effectiveness and Efficiency and to a lesser extent on gender equity. •The use of household survey data is clearly outlined, and well utilised in responding to impact •Desk based review is utilised to respond to questions around relevance, and throughout the findings section.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Partially	<p>Causal factors are identified, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Impact of COVID 19 on activities •The impact of decades of armed conflict and disease outbreaks •Centralised vs decentralised management of disease outbreaks <p>Although the evaluation is theory based (in part) there is no analysis of the logic chain, or reference in the findings section to the theory of change presented earlier in the report. This could be because the ToC was constructed retrospectively by the evaluation team at inception stage, however, it should still have been referred back to, or a reason given as to why it was not appropriate to do so.</p> <p>Additionally there was no reference as to how a participatory approach was applied, and how it influenced data collection and analysis and findings.</p>
Question 14.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		

	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Partially	The evaluation outlines what UNICEF's monitoring system was during the period of the intervention, and how data was gathered real time to inform weekly situation reports, as well as longer term monitoring of the overarching intervention. It does not, however, comment on the appropriateness of the monitoring systems or relate them to the wider results, or the Theory of Change.
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).	Partially	The conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the objectives, except in relation to understanding perspectives of specific groups of people, for example women and children. The conclusions are not particularly forward looking, and could be improved if there was greater reference to the continuation of UNICEF's (and other partners work) after the period of this evaluation (2018-2020), and their ongoing responses to later Ebola outbreaks (EvD 11 and 12), as well as interventions on other diseases such as implementation of the Measles's plan which ran up until 2021. These interventions are outside of the timescale of the evaluation, but activities would have been ongoing during the period that the evaluation was being undertaken and written (2022).
	ii Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Partially	The conclusions are derived from the findings, particularly the summaries of each finding, and do reflect a picture of strengths and weaknesses of the interventions stating that "Overall, UNICEF's support to MoH in the design and execution of the response to other outbreaks such as COVID-19, Cholera, Measles, and Plague demonstrated varying degree of success." pp43. The different aspects of implementation are then discussed. There is some added insight from the consultants, presumably from their personal experience. Limitations of the intervention, and reasons for this could be stronger.
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.	Partially	There are three lessons, which do have wider applicability and relevance. However there are some issues which would better ground and improve the lessons: •Lesson one states that a "health zone approach" should be adopted. This is the first time this phrase has been used, and it was not defined earlier in the intervention. However, the detail of it relates to a more decentralised approach to Public Health Emergencies. Understanding of this lesson would have been strengthened if, as noted earlier in the review, the context of the intervention in terms of scope and object were clearer, and the term health zone approach defined and discussed in the findings section. More detail on what was learned about a "human-centred" approach would also be useful. • Lesson 2 on multisectoral/ partnership work makes sense and clearly relates to findings. •Lesson 3 makes reference to sustainability and the 90 day sustainability plan, so again, as noted earlier in the review explicit sight or summary of this plan would aid in understanding the context of this lesson.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons are clear in parts, and concise, but do not contain sufficient detail to be useful to intended audiences. As noted above defining health zones and what precisely a decentralised approach might look like in reality would help, as would summarising what the actions and plans on sustainability actually were, and how the previous learning could be built upon.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	38%	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.	Partially	<p>The recommendations meet the evaluation purpose and are derived from the findings, however their clarity could be improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not bringing in information which was not adequately (or at all) discussed in the findings and conclusions, for example remuneration of health care staff and bottlenecks - both mentioned in the recommendations but neither analysed in any detail. •Not using acronyms for the first time in recommendations that have not been previously outlined or listed in the acronym list - for example it is assumed that EFF means Efficiency and COD means Coordination, but this should be explicit, not assumed. It is useful to identify which evaluation question different recommendations relate to, but this should have been clearly explained. •Due to the lack of forward looking analysis (as noted above), exploring what UNICEF has continued to do after 2020 (the end of the evaluation timescale) and the publication of the evaluation in 2022, it is difficult to know if some recommendations have already been implemented, for example there is some indication that the research unit set up by UNICEF (IOA/CAI) has continued to gather real time data on disease outbreaks and conduct research, and that a decentralised approach to Public Health Emergencies has already been taken on board, but clarity on which recommendations have already been adopted, or plan to be adopted, would be very helpful to know.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	<p>The recommendations are useful, and appear to be actionable, but as stated above it is unclear which of the recommendations (or parts of them) have already been actioned.</p> <p>There is some useful guidance on implementation of the individual elements of the recommendations, however, there is a lack of clarity on the precise roles of primary and secondary partners. Secondary partners in particular comprise a large cohort that includes other UN agencies, donors, I/NGOs and other partners. It is assumed that partners engagement with, and adoption of, the recommendations will vary, and that the expectations on each will be different - clarification on this would be important to provide.</p>
	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	<p>There is a sentence which states how the recommendations were developed (pp46), but this simply states that all those involved in the evaluation were asked about their aspirations for the future, using the engagement tools (KIs, FGDs etc.). This would be expected as part of the data collection phase, but does not demonstrate a strong link to recommendation development. Points of improvement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Specific detail on how MoH as a duty bearer (and joint implementation partner of two of the three recommendations) were directly consulted during the process of developing the recommendations. There is a risk that if they were not closely involved in this process, they will not feel ownership of the recommendations and therefore there is less chance they will be successfully implemented. •Specific detail of how rights holders were consulted on the recommendations as they directly relate to people's lives. There was also no explanation of why rights bearers were not consulted. One way to engage rights holders may have been to consult with Community Influencers (defined earlier in the report as people of influence in communities) as well local health care workers, also defined earlier in the report - both particularly useful to consult when a decentralised approach to managing Public Health Emergencies is being recommended.
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	<p>The duty bearers responsible for each recommendation are identified, but as noted above the role of different groups responsible for implementing the recommendations (as a primary or secondary partner) is not clearly defined.</p> <p>Recommendations are classified as strategic or operational, and prioritised as short, medium or long term, but as noted above the lack of clarity on which (if any) recommendations, or parts of them, may have already been implemented at the time of writing the report would strengthen this section and support its utility.</p>
SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		86%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages are appropriate and clear with all expected data for a UNICEF report.

	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 appendices/ annexes contain almost all relevant information, including additional qualitative data. However, as noted above a working link, or copy of, SRP4 should be provided along with details of how it was different to earlier SRPs, and copies or links to those also provided. The 90 Day sustainability plan should also have been included in the annexes.
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 evaluation is clearly structured and well formatted.
	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 meets UNICEF guidelines with regard to report structure.
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	The report is clearly set out and of an appropriate length.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The report is written for a technical audience, so meets the requirements of reporting to UNICEF and other stakeholders (like most evaluations are) it is unclear how (or if) feedback on the results of the evaluation were presented to rights holders. The evaluation has several minor spelling errors, and a number of acronyms are missing but is generally free from 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.	Yes	The evaluation uses maps, tables, infographics, and figures throughout the report, and they are clearly labelled and referenced.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	36%	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	Human Rights Based Approaches are a criteria of the evaluation, but are not referenced either as a framework or benchmark for the design 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).	Partially	A reference group was established, but it is unclear how members were chosen, and whether the evaluators or UNICEF set up this group. It is also unclear how/ if rights holders were involved in the conduct or planning of the evaluation. It is stated that they would be involved as part of a participatory approach, but little evidence as to how this works in practice is provided.
	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	Language is appropriate, however very little data is disaggregated, except in some cases by gender, and there is limited discussion of, and reference to, marginalized 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.	Partially	The evaluation does not adequately address these issues. However marginalised groups are included in the analysis by analysing data from children and women from excluded environments.
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)	3	
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Partially integrated	The evaluation includes Gender, Equity and HRBA as a dedicated criteria, with evaluation questions to explore this. However these issues are not integrated across the evaluation, and by treating them as a separate issue has limited the type of data that was collected and the ways in which it was analysed.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	The methodology noted that data collected in KIIs and FGDs would be from men and women equally, and focus group discussion were conducted in single sex environments with communities. Some of the data gathered during the evaluation was therefore able to be disaggregated by sex. Unfortunately the analysis did not take a gender-responsive approach and there was little presentation of analysis of evidence that was gender specific and outlined views of women and girls in particular, despite this being important to know, and part of the first evaluation question.

iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	<p>The findings and conclusions do mention disaggregated data, but do not analyse the data from a gendered perspective. Recommendation three relates to greater integration of gender by implementing partners and communities, but the evidence for this is not cross cutting across the whole evaluation.</p> <p>Additionally there is no mention of intersectionality, or of how different vulnerable groups, including women and girls, are adversely or differently affected by Public Health Emergencies, and the structural causes for this. Without this level of analysis in the findings and conclusion it is hard to see how the recommendation three can be appropriately implemented</p>
-----	---	----------------------	---

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 GEEW 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 GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?</p>