

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Mothers @ Work Programme being implemented in the Ready-Made Garments Sector of Bangladesh

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	50%	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	Mothers @ Work Programme being implemented in the Ready-Made Garments Sector of Bangladesh		
Report sequence number	Bangladesh 64-2023-18788		
Region	SAR		
Year of report	2023		
Office	Bangladesh		
Coverage (countries)	Bangladesh		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	January 12, 2024		
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	No		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
Evaluation object	Programme		
Evaluation type	Formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	2, 3, 5		
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>Summary: This is an interesting and important evaluation – and has a sound methodology for a sensitive topic. However, the numbering of evaluation questions under "Section 4 - Evaluation Findings" (page 37 onwards) is not accurate, ensuing significant shortcomings. It does not correspond to the Evaluation Matrix provided in Annexure 3 (page 142). For instance, there is no Evaluation Question 4.7 or 4.7.2 including those presented in Table 14. This discrepancy was drawn to the attention of UNICEF, but the assessor was informed that as the report had been published it could not be edited further. Given it is likely that this is the result of the of 'automatic numbering', this could be easily remedied. The reviewer suggests withdrawing the report for editing and reposting it. This would be beneficial as the report highlights an apparently successful programme and a simple review of this section would allow stakeholders to easily make sense of the findings. The ratings given below are based on the report with mis-matched numbering.</p> <p>Key Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Appropriate methodology for a sensitive topic; * Generally clear presentation although some of the Annexures are not complete e.g. Annexure 9 * Prioritised recommendations * Annexure 7 provides a good demographic profile but then this is not used in the analysis beyond the focus on type of family. <p>Main Weakness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * As indicated above in the summary, Section 4 warrants greater editing and revision. The evaluation question number used in this section and in Table 8 are not consistent with the usage either in Table 4 or Annexure 3. This leads to confusion as to which questions are being answered. * Presentation of analytical data is not clear and there is limited attention (except the discussion on nuclear / extended families) on whether young women with their first child / older women with second or third child may use the services provided in different ways. This is a critical issue if the scheme is to be expanded in the context of cultural issues around family decision making etc. * The scoring used in the 'report card' (Table 8) to respond to Evaluation Questions, needs to be explained. Additional information would allow for greater coherency and could provide a useful summary of the evaluation for wider dissemination. * Annexure 9 on tools only provides the consent form and no details of the questionnaire (This is not included in the inception report either.) * The Executive Summary needs to be brought into line with the edited Section 4 - and the summary table presented in a way that is usable by a range of stakeholders. This also applies to the recommendations. <p>Finally points to note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ToRs are not part of the report and no 'hot-link' to the Geros website where they are present. 2. Management Response on Geros website is 'empty' 			
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>			

Recommendations:

1. Normal procedure for an organisation would indicate that a report with this type of editing issue (not methodological) be re-edited to ensure that the relevant section is coherent, readable and findings are clearly laid out. If this is not possible due to existing policy guidance, then perhaps UNICEF could put a 'warning' on the GEROS page that there are challenges in Section 4. This is an important report on an area that is vital for women working in the RMG sector (and beyond) that is generally methodologically sound and could easily be made more readable through an editing process.
2. The analysis includes more cross-analysis using the collected demographic data that was collected. This would enable, potentially, a more detailed understanding of when, how and why different women take up the services on offer and what is best suited to their needs. Pregnant and lactating women have a large number of other characteristics which may affect their needs and the way they may wish to interact with the services that may be designed and provided for them.
3. Further consideration is given (e.g. a recommendation) around how a future study and / or scale up of this work could be more inclusive in relation to women with disabilities who may be working in the RMG and other sectors and also be pregnant / lactating. Are there specific issues that need to be addressed so that what is likely to be a minority of women are also aided in their efforts to find dignity at work.
4. Once Section 4 has been edited that the Executive Summary is brought into line with the summary table being more clearly presented for stakeholders.

SECTION RATINGS

SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		50%	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 current executive summary is of a suitable length and includes 2 pages of recommendations. It would need editing again once Section 4 has been revised and it would be helpful if the presentation of the recommendations could be made clearer - including the target / prioritisation elements. This would be vital if to be used as a 'stand-alone' document.
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 summary could include a little more on the reconstructed TOC and how this has informed the evaluation. This is critical given the intended aim of the evaluation is to inform the expansion within the RMG sector and beyond by 2030.
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	No additional information is added into the Executive Summary. The use of an updated Table 8 (main report) could aid understanding of the evaluation and its key findings.
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.	Partially	The intervention is well described and includes a table of the costs / budget. It also includes details of the location, timeline and implementation status. What is not explained is why such as relatively large scale evaluation was required (scale-up?) given the ToR budget of \$100,000 when the overall budget for the work (as presented) is less than \$900,000. More on the 'pathway' to scale would perhaps have been helpful - if this is already being set out as an aim as in the ToRs.
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	There is generally a reasonable background, including rights holders but there are some issues which could be addressed: * figure 2 on page 3 is 10 years out of date and does not link with the data in the narrative; *one stakeholder not included is the factory owner (may not be the same as the manager) and hence the possible profitability of their enterprise when engaged in the M@G programme (this also affects the Cost / Benefit Analysis work). * it is not always clear 'who pays for the child care' and whether this has implications for the women / factory owners? * Annexure 7 provides some details of the demographic of respondents. There is no map which might indicate the location of the factories and where the women come from (including areas where migrated from). For women who travel home to breastfeed what is the geographical relationship with their working site.
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	Yes the background information including policies, key government and non-governmental stakeholders are well described.
ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	Whilst the SDGs are mentioned (section 1.1.3 page 6) with reference to 2, 3, 4 and 5 there is no detailed examination of this - including in Figure 7, page 19.
iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The challenges (and opportunities) facing women who work in the RMG industry are explained. However, despite some information in Annexure 7 on demographics, detailed analysis of the possible differences among the female population (age, education, geographical background, number of children) is not well laid out. Differences in nuclear / extended family does receive attention.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		

	i Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	Yes, this is well covered even if language of 'duty bearers' is not used. There is not a 'stakeholder map' as such but Figure 5 does present the range of stakeholders from the personal to the wider environment (a social-ecological model for representing stakeholders).
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	Whilst it is clear that the programme was implemented through partners (ILO and BRAC) the actual management of the M@W could have perhaps been more carefully, and succinctly, described - including the decision to use ILO monitoring processes rather than set up a specific one for the M@W. A table with the roles and responsibilities of the partners would be useful to clarify (including budget allocation).
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	Yes the purpose of the evaluation is defined and the timing is understood in relation to development of approaches to scale out the M@W programme in the RMG sector and possibly other sectors by 2030.
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 ToRs are not included in the evaluation report received (on GEROS website) and there are no changes 'flagged' from the ToRs. However, the report does highlight some limitations including around the practical sampling, inclusion of differently abled people and issues around privacy for interviews etc.
	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	Whilst the description is generally sound, more attention could have been given to issues around monitoring data availability (or not) from UNICEF and ILO that would have complemented the evaluation teams data collection.
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 ToR requested the construction of a TOC which is included. But the linkage between the TOC, the indicators (and any results framework) to the Evaluation Questions / Matrix is not made.
	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 diagram is presented in the document but then not used.
	iii For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Partially	The TOC was constructed as an element of the ToRs. It was not then really integrated into the evaluation, nor discussed on the basis of the evaluation findings in relation to possible scale-up work in the future i.e. the critical elements that would need to be fully addressed to ensure the outcomes and hence impacts were met. One element that is perhaps not well addressed here is the consequences of the M@W programme for Business Owners (not just managers) and the wider RMG supply chain certification processes (if applicable).
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	64%	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.	Partially	The evaluation questions are presented in Annexure 3 - but the high level question appears as question 1 in each case rather than numbered consecutively. This leads to confusion within the report itself including in Table 4 where the 'high level' question does not make an explicit appearance. The sources of data etc are fine - but it would have been good to perhaps have a summary about each question in the Annex along with some indication of the quality / confidence of the data used to make the overall assessment against the 'rubric'.

	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 linkage between the questions and indicators (rubric) is not made explicitly and neither is there any clarity on the assumptions which arise from the reconstructed TOC and the indicators presented there. The Evaluation Matrix (Annexure 3) provides the following: Evaluation Question, Source of Data, Methodology, Proposed Benchmark/Indicator and a view on the evaluability assessment. These are not used in detail in this evaluation - and given one purpose of the evaluation is to inform decisions on scale up clear 'testing' of the TOC would be helpful to aid future design.
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 tools proposed are sensible for this evaluation but there is no detail in Annexure 9 of the Data Collection Tools (not in the Inception report Annexure 10 page 79). This means that no assessment can be made either of their suitability nor the use that is made of the evidence gathered and how it informs the findings (Section 4).
	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	Annexure 3 (Evaluation Matrix) and Annexure 4 (Methodology) are sensible but more details could have been provided regarding the tools and the limitations. Page 23, Section 3.1 and Figure 8 lay out more detail on the evaluation design and data sources. This includes Key Informant Interviews, Surveys, Focus group discussions at Factory Level, Secondary data review in a mixed methods approach. This enables both qualitative and quantitative data be obtained and combined.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	This is provided in Annexure 4. The limitations in the practical application of the strategy are discussed on page 34. The approach indicates the split between pregnant and lactating mothers in both the intervention and control groups. No further details on the diversity is provided e.g. household type, first child or older mothers.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Partially	This is generally fine but there seems to be some confusion about the presence of a 'baseline' (5 pilot factories) and the overall 'project baseline' (not available). How the pilot baseline is used is often not clear and could have warranted a more detailed discussion, and if appropriate, used in the finding sections. How did the wider evaluation findings compare to the pilot baseline and to the control sites used?
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Partially	The methodology could have enabled this but the focus on the OECD-DAC criteria / evaluation questions for presentation of findings rather than the reconstructed TOC or a M@W results framework (or relevant elements of the ILO framework) means that these causal connections are not clearly laid out. This may affect the lessons learnt to inform scale up of the M@W programme within the RMG and other sectors for 2030.
	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 well laid out in section 3.7 (page 34). This also highlights the challenge for this evaluation around inclusion of the differently abled.
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	Yes - there is reference in both the main body of the text and in the Annexure 4 Extended Methodology.
	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 significant attention to the issue of Ethical safeguards which is vital given the sensitive nature of the work of M@W and this evaluation. One question might be asked and that is in relation to the permission of the mother (and her child) on the front cover of the inception and evaluation reports. Has full permission been given for this usage? If so it should be acknowledged in the 'front section' of the report.
Question 11.		Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		

i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could be evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.

Partially	The approach was adapted to take into account that most of the interviews would be undertaken at the women's place of work. Given the sensitive nature of the topic there are risks and opportunities with this approach - privacy is vital. These were held in factories in quiet spaces with some privacy. Male and female workers were interviewed separately. There was also observation of the sampled facilities. The innovation is not so much the tools and approach used but that it was recognised that this was an important tool in such as sensitive area and being able to obtain permission to do this work without affecting the women's ability to work / engage with the study. The team also recognised that in the RMG sector it was not possible to address issues of disability and how this might affect the way pregnant / lactating women took up the services. This could perhaps be part of a further study - especially in relation to scale up of the learning.
-----------	--

SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	25%	Comments on Rating
Question 12.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	No	The challenge of reading Section 4 on Evaluation Findings given the numbering flaws fundamentally affects any systematic approach to addressing the evaluation questions presented in Annexure 4. In the narrative evaluation questions are not present in the Evaluation Matrix e.g. 4.7 and often are given to 3 points 4.7.2 which do not exist. The summary matrix is not explained and the list of Evaluation Questions does not match Annexure 8. The section is so flawed that it effectively is unreadable and unusable - especially by the wide range of Stakeholders for which this report is intended.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	The development of the M@W TOC was an explicit requirement of the ToRs and is presented on page 17 (Section 2.5). This could have been used more effectively in the presentation of findings (including use of the indicators), but the focus of Section 4 (findings) was on the Evaluation Questions under the OECD-DAC criteria. This leads perhaps to a disconnect between the reality of the projects achievements and the focus of the evaluation on understanding how that happened, for whom, why and where (for instance control data shows high understanding of the importance of breast feeding so the 'added value' of M@W in some area may be low).
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	The evaluation matrix is presented in Annexure 3 and indicates the source of data, approach, benchmarks and evaluation assessment. This would have been further bolstered if the Evaluation Matrix included an assessment of the quality of the data available from different sources and therefore of the confidence with which it was used within the evaluation to inform the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations. Explicit triangulation is often missing in Section 4
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	No	Section 4 highlights that a wide range of evidence was gathered and it could be usable to answer the evaluation questions. Annexure 3 gives the potential source of data. Currently there is little attempt (beyond the family type) to undertake cross-demographic analysis. The findings are often presented as if the women are a single group and yet given the data in Annexure 7, it is clear that there are major differences within the sample. Understanding how the different factors interact may enable greater understanding of the uptake and any specific conditions that may be required for instance for a young, poorly educated woman from a nuclear family with her first child compared with an older woman with a second or third child with a higher degree of education from an extended family. If this work is to be scaled out to other RMG factories and other sectors have a deeper understanding of the 'intersectionality' of factors may aid design of services and targeting of information to support different groups of women.
	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	There is significant attention, in some areas, to the context of the operation of this programme - not least around sensitive cultural issues e.g. nuclear / extended family expectation. Given the reconstruction of the M@W TOC was a key requirement for this evaluation it would have been helpful to have a more detailed Annexure on the wider causal factors that affect this programme from the personal through to the partnership approach. Implications of the assumptions of the TOC could then have been used to inform discussion of the potential for scale up to the 2030 objective within the RMG sector and other sector employing women who may be pregnant or lactating.

Question 14.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	No	On page 91 the evaluation indicates that: Further, instead of establishing a separate monitoring system for the programme, which could have potentially been duplicative, UNICEF utilised ILO's preexisting monitoring systems and enterprise advisors (EAs) to monitor M@W alongside BWB. Consequently, UNICEF's expenses on the partnership were limited to the payments of EAs only. The evaluation team noted that among the EAs there appeared to be a greater emphasis and focus on the ILO-BWB programme. It is recommended that the responsibilities and accountabilities of the EAs need to be clarified to ensure a more balanced approach towards the M@W programme. There is no presentation in an Annexure of the M@W results framework (or relevant elements of the ILO framework) in the evaluation report.
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 presented in Section 5 but there is no linkage to the Table 8 'report card' (which needs editing and improving). A better linkage between the Section 5 and Section 4 (when edited) is required so that there is greater clarity around the conclusions based on a clear presentation of the wide range of evidence collected.
	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	See above = this may be rated higher when Section 4 is edited and attention to disaggregation of data from the survey based on a number of parameters pertinent to the women involved.
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	The lessons are valuable and could be applied to any discussion regarding scale up of the M@W programme within the RMG and other sections. As indicated due to the current state of Section 4 it may be that not all lessons are captured due to perhaps a lack of disaggregation of the results from different classes of women (age, first/second/third child, education level etc).
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons presented are fine - but given that in Section 4 there are some areas where perhaps further analysis might yield a more differentiated understanding of uptake of the services under M@W it is not clear if all lessons are presented. This may result in the intended audience only understanding part of the challenges for working mothers of different backgrounds.
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.	Partially	Given the structural issues with the Section 4 on Findings this is difficult to judge, but the recommendations correspond to what may be expected for a programme of this type in circumstances where there is a desire to expand the scope through to 2030. Whether they are complete will depend on Section 4 being more clearly laid out.
	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 clearly laid out and targeted/ prioritised. They cover both 'Strategic and Operational' issues. The colour coding is explained in footnote 126 on page 131 but there is no definition of what 'strategic' or 'operational' means in the context of these evaluation recommendations. This could ensure that the reader is clear what is meant by these terms as well as the prioritisation approach.
	iii Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	No	There is no description in Section 7 of the process of development of the recommendations with stakeholders / duty-bearers by the evaluation team. There does not appear to have been a workshop or process to validate the recommendations before preparation of the report.
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	Section 7 contains the recommendations. These are linked to the Evaluation Questions (assume as numbered in Table 4 but not clear) and laid out in a tabular fashion with clear targets audience and prioritisation. Whilst the language of 'duty-bearer' is not used it is clear which organisation should be involved in each recommendation.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	43%	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	Front pages are present and do layout the key elements required.
	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	Annexures are present - but Annexure 1 does not actually contain the ToRs nor a link to them on-line. More information could be provided on relation to the results achieved, the work done on the ToC (and perhaps how this could be 'scaled' up within the RMG and other businesses that employ women. There is no detail of the data collection tools (and these are not in the Inception Report Annexure 10 page 79 either). Concerns could be raised about the formal and language of the Consent Form given the educational levels of the women involved in the evaluation (Annexure 9 page 166). There is no summary results framework provided for example showing what the M@W programme was designed to achieve and what was achieved e.g. number of businesses, numbers of women, etc.
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 overall structure is fine - but stylistically the use of columns in the report make reading 'on screen' difficult (especially smaller screens).
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The structure of the report follows the UNICEF 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	There is no specification in the ToR regarding the length of the report which is 197 pages long including Annexures and the main report (including front section) is 155 pages.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	No	The report is generally easy to understand but Section 4 on findings is incorrectly signposted with the wrong labelling of the evaluation questions making this section very difficult to follow. There are minor spelling errors but generally not so as to affect the understanding. (Note this score would be higher if Section 4 was edited).
	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.	No	While the report includes some tables / figures, some are not clear - specifically in Section 4. The tables outlined in Section 4 provide the rating against the assessment rubric, however there is no summary of the data on which the assessment is made in the table. (Note this score would be higher if Section was edited)
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	52%	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.	Partially	The issue of right-based work and its contribution to the sustainability of the programme is included - although the programme itself only provides support for 12 months and longer term follow up is not addressed per se.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Partially	The pregnant and lactating women who are the focus of the M@W programme (along with the business managers / owners) are included in the evaluation in relation to the questionnaire survey and discussions. However, it is not clear if they were involved in the design of the evaluation itself for instance through pilot work / adapt questionnaires to include perhaps issues of relevance to them that perhaps were not included by the research team.

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	Given the diversity of the women highlighted in Annexure 7 (Demographic) there is little exploration of whether the differences in age (or first / second child?) made a difference in the take up of services. Useful exploration of nuclear / extended family and issue of migration for work but could have been explored further to bring any lessons in relation to the scale up with the RMG industry and beyond. Examples of the wider understanding of the issues and range of complex issues that the M@W programme addresses are: Page 106 for instance recognised the potential of the M@W programme for the M@W programme 'to enhance access to health and nutrition services for the marginalised workers, who lack the means to adopt appropriate nutrition and health practice.' Page 120: 'Gender transformation is an intentional process of moving beyond addressing the gendered challenges at an individual level - to redressing structural causes of inequalities and reshaping unequal power dynamics that perpetuate them. To achieve this, interventions are required to critically examine gender roles, norms, and dynamics, strengthen positive norms that support an enabling environment and promote the relative position of women, girls, and 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.	Partially	Whilst LNOB is not used explicitly in the report, the focus on maternal and child benefits from the programme is welcomed. There is one area recognised as a limitation (page 35) around differently abled women. This is an area, due to lack of participants in this category to participate in the survey, which is not addressed. Indicating more clearly the links with the SDGs and the LNOB agenda may have been helpful in the conclusions. What might the contribution of the M@W programme be to meeting the countries SDG commitments?
Question 23.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	5	
i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Satisfactorily integrated	This evaluation does consider GEEW at all stages in this evaluation.
ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	This evaluation is focused around highly sensitive personal and cultural issues. The Evaluation Team have, from the report, considered the approach carefully - including aspects of privacy for discussions in the work environment.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	Given the current state of Section 4 on findings it is not easy to see the extent of the integration in these sections. The M@W programme is clearly focused on women and their children but does it always enable the voice of the women to be heard and their priorities understood and addressed alongside those of the businesses?

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>