

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of UNICEF Lebanon Country Office's Approach to Local Level System Strengthening and Programming

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	42%	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	Evaluation of UNICEF Lebanon Country Office's Approach to Local Level System Strengthening		
Report sequence number	Lebanon/59/2023/18799		
Region	MENA		
Year of report	2023		
Office	Lebanon CO - PRIME/FO		
Coverage (countries)	Lebanon		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	18-21 January 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	Yes		
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes		
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Evaluation object	Country Programme		
Evaluation type	Formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	Not stated in report, but generally - SDG 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16		
EQA Summary: <i>The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.</i>			
This evaluation of UNICEF Lebanon Country's Office Approach to Local Level System Strengthening and Programming provides a useful review of the context and is clear regarding its limitations, especially related to accessing documentation. However, the findings, lessons learned and conclusions and ensuing lessons learned and recommendations require revision to clearly indicate supporting evidence and linkages (the ToR states that each finding, conclusion and recommendation should be numbered and the link between them should be clearly explicit in the conclusions and recommendations section). Its strengths and weaknesses are outlined below followed by topline recommendations for improvements.			
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>			
<p>Topline recommendations to improve the evaluation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >Review entire document for clarity including grammar and sentence structure. >Restructure the findings, conclusions and recommendations section so that each finding/conclusion/recommendation is numbered. For conclusions and recommendations, the authors should clearly link back to the findings (or, in the case of recommendations either specific findings or the relevant conclusions, as appropriate). >Review and revise the findings section to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ----- Ensure triangulation. If triangulation is not possible, clearly state so. ----- Ensure each finding contains supporting evidence (as written, some findings are statements without supporting evidence). ----- Ensure that findings are in agreement and do not contradict one another. ----- Ensure that findings are listed under the appropriate criterion. ----- Remove any information that would be more appropriate for the context/introduction section, recommendations or conclusions sections (see detailed feedback below). ----- Ensure all information discussed in the 'in summary sections' of the different finding subsections do not contain new information that was not explored within the preceding findings. >Ensure that conclusions clearly draw from the findings. >Ensure that lessons learned and good practices stem from findings from the evaluation. >Ensure that recommendations clearly link back to conclusions/findings and are supported by evidence. >Reorganise the recommendations section so that they are prioritised and more clearly indicate the responsible party as well as a suggested timeline and level of effort (e.g., low, medium, high), if possible. 			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	33%	Comments on Rating	
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		

	i	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Partially	The executive summary is 5 pages in length. The executive summary is not presented in a way that allows it to be a standalone document. The findings summaries lack critical details in order for them to 'make sense' to the reader. Some findings are not findings, but rather commentary without any supporting evidence. The executive summary conclusions section does not appear to be supported by the findings summarised above it. This disconnect makes it difficult for the executive summary to give a clear picture of the evaluation and its findings. Further, the recommendations are unclear and do not contain enough information to be easily understood or useful to the reader.
	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 an overview of the LLSS approach, the evaluation purpose, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learnt and recommendations. Although, as noted above, these points are not detailed enough to be useful.
	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.	No	The reviewer did not note any new information in the executive summary from what was presented in the rest of the report. The executive summary does not contain all significant information needed to understand the intervention and evaluation. The executive summary should have contained some country context and additional information on the LLSS approach.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			57%	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	Section 1 includes a situational analysis of Lebanon including demographic data, political developments and security situation, economic development, basic social services, local government and governance, and local level systems strengthening in Lebanon. However, section 1 does not provide a sufficient overview of the LLSS approach in UNICEF. Section 1 should be revised to more clearly lay out the LLSS approach. This could be done by pulling from the ToR which conveys the LLSS approach's original and current way of working much more clearly. Section 1 also includes an overview of the UNICEF Lebanon Country Programme.
	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	The report notes certain actors throughout the report, but does not clearly convey the landscape in which the project is operating as it relates to intended rightsholders and duty bearers by type and geographic location. Adding this information either as a visual within the body of the report with accompanying narrative or as an annex would be helpful for the reader to understand the rightsholders and duty bearers in the areas where interventions are being undertaken.
Question 3.		Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The report provides in-depth information into the national context in which the LLSS approach is operating.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	No	Linkages to the SDGs and its relevant targets are not stated.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The report provides sufficient context and information related to the situation of rightsholders in section 1.
Question 4.		Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Partially	The report does not include this information. While a stakeholder mapping was referenced in the body of the report and while the report directs readers to Annex 4 for the stakeholder mapping, Annex 4 is simply a list of participants, not a full stakeholder mapping. By listing the individuals interviewed, the readers gain a sense of the types of implementing agencies, partners and other stakeholders. However, it would be beneficial to include the stakeholder mapping performed for the evaluation and not just a list of those engaged in the evaluation process.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	The report is clear that only interventions that were supported by UNICEF were included. However, a full list of interventions alongside funding information by donor and other roles of key stakeholders is not available. It would be helpful to have an overview of the full scope of the evaluation including each intervention and the contributions of the different stakeholders as an annex.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			58%	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.	Partially	<p>The evaluation's purpose is clear. However, the report does not include why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use and key intended users. These should be added in section 2. The ToR contains useful text that could easily be added to the final report.</p> <p>From ToR: 'This evaluation is being conducted primarily for learning purposes and to inform the UNICEF Lebanon upcoming Country Programme 2023 – 2026/7. This evaluation will provide an independent assessment of UNICEF LCO's approach to local community level systems strengthening and programming (both localization and governance). It is expected to provide a deep dive into the approach by examining the design, implementation, and achievements of this approach over the last 4 years of implementation; and identifying success factors, critical barriers, and enablers to implement UNICEF localization programming approach.'</p> <p>From ToR: 'Intended Use: The evaluation is designed and expected to: i) Provide evidence that will assist UNICEF, donors and implementing partners in improving future programme aiming at local level systems strengthening design and implementation. ii) Provide substantive evidence to facilitate implementation of the new cycle of the CPD 2022 – 2026/7 (under preparation), as well as feed into the new UNSDCF process. Users: i) The target audience and primary users of the findings of the evaluation are UNICEF Management, Field Offices, and programmes, as well as implementing partners such as the Government stakeholders. Local</p>
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	Section 2.2 lists the objectives of the evaluation and these slightly differ from those included in the ToR. However, no changes from the ToR are noted and these should be added.
	ii Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	Section 2.1 sufficiently describes the scope including the time period included under the evaluation and the locations.
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 report displays the logic model in figure 3, but does not include a description of the intended results or parts of the results chain that are applicable to 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).	Yes	This is done through figure 3.
	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.	No	<p>The ToR for the evaluation states that the evaluation team will use the programme logic (or reconstruct it) as the analytical framework for data collection and analysis in the form of results areas to collect data on and to test the validity of the ToC. The inception report does not include this language and no analysis on the validity of the ToC was performed. It is unclear why this was removed and clarity on this should be added.</p> <p>From ToR: 'Design: This formative evaluation is expected to use a non – experimental design, drawing from 'theory-based' approach; The evaluation will use the programme logic (or reconstruct it) as its analytical framework for data collection and analysis in the form of result areas to collect data on, and hypotheses on the validity of the Theory of Change (TOC).'</p>
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	55%	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	Annex 2 contains key questions asked under the evaluation with the relevant TOR question. The key questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. However, there are some questions in the ToR that do not appear to be answered by the key questions of the evaluation as presented in the final report (Annex 2). For example, the question 'to what extent has the approach been relevant to the overall UNICEF LCO programme strategy?' is not clearly answered by the key questions in column 1 of the table. However, findings related to this are presented within the final report. There are other examples of key questions not answering all ToR questions. The report would benefit from a concise explanation of how the key questions were arrived at.
	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	Annex 3 of the inception report and Annex 2 of the final report contain an evaluation matrix with key questions, relevant TOR questions, methods and respondents. A second table within Annex 3 of the inception report includes the OECD DAC criteria, the corresponding evaluation question and quantitative indicators. The report would benefit from including one table with OECD DAC criteria, evaluation questions/subquestions, indicators and assumptions.
Question 9.		Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i	Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Partially	The evaluation report describes the evaluation design and set of methods. The data collection and analysis methods are relevant and adequately robust given the evaluation's purpose, objectives scope and level of effort. The evaluation design and methods are not fully and clearly described in the methodology section. For example, the report states that a gender lens was used and that the methodology was disability-sensitive, but does not include information on how this was done until section 4.1 (for gender only). All information regarding the methodology belongs in the methodology section for better logical flow. As presented, the methodology related to gender is only made available in the findings section halfway through the report (in section 4.1). There is no further details regarding how the evaluation was disability-sensitive and this information should be added.
	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	Data sources are appropriate and include both qualitative and quantitative sources. The report is clear regarding the limitations faced with regard to availability of some secondary data.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The sampling strategy is provided and includes a diverse set of stakeholders. The sampling frame is available in Annex 6. As an added benefit, the report could have revised this table to include the targeted numbers alongside the actual numbers that the evaluation was able to achieve.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Section 2.3.5 sufficiently describes the methods of analysis.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for causal connections by way of contribution to be made.
	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	The report contains a limitations section but it is difficult to understand the challenge/limitation and mitigation strategy(ies) for each. The report would benefit from revising how this information is presented. For example, a table that clearly and more concisely conveys the limitation in one column with a second column for mitigation strategies would allow readers to more easily understand the challenges faced and what the team did to overcome or mitigate these. As written, some limitations list mitigating efforts while others do not.
Question 10.		Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i	Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	No	The report does not reference this. Further, the inception report cites the 2008 guidance and it is unclear why the outdated guidance was used.
	ii	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	No	The report states that ethical clearance was obtained from the Ethical Review Board of UNICEF. However, a description of ethical safeguards are not included in the final report. These should be summarised in the body of the report or provided as an annex.
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.

No	No innovative practices were used. The evaluation employed FGDs, KIs and document review. For data processing, the evaluation used Atlas.ti.
----	--

SECTION E: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)		33%	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	The findings often lack sufficient levels of evidence to answer the evaluation's questions and subquestions. Please see detailed feedback under question 13, below.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	The findings are organised by OECD DAC criteria but explore the two outputs (output 1 and 2) that are directly related to the local governance work as described in the ToR. The report would benefit from more clearly linking the findings to the intervention logic within the discussions of each finding.
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	Based on the list of those interviewed and the documentation shared, it appears that the evaluation has used credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. The report would improve by more clearly conveying how findings were triangulated and if they were unable to be triangulating, stating so and stating why. There is also a lack of triangulation and in-depth analysis based on multiple sources of data throughout the findings section. If a finding is based on one individual, this should be made more explicit. If there are findings that were unable to be triangulated, this should be stated within the findings section.
	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	The findings section requires a thorough review and revision. Overall, the findings section's deficiencies can be summarised in the following categories: 1) Presence of many statements/assessments/conclusions that lack any supporting evidence 2) Presence of many statements/assessments/conclusions that are misplaced and do not correspond to the criterion/heading including those that are more appropriate for other sections of the report (e.g., context, recommendations or conclusions sections), not findings 3) Presence of unclear links between findings and the evaluation's assessment or conclusion. The evaluation does not clearly articulate links between findings and the evaluation's assessment/conclusion. 4) Presence of many findings that are poorly worded, making comprehension difficult 5) Presence of findings that appear to contradict one another 6) Lastly, the 'in summary' sections of the different finding subsections contain new information that was not explored within the preceding findings. 1) Some findings lack supporting evidence. Examples follow, but this is not an exhaustive list and there are many findings that lack supporting evidence throughout the different findings subsections. The entire section of gender and human rights lacks sufficient evidence as a whole section. Other sections also lack evidence and examples follow. Under relevance: 'Though limited and perhaps assessed more as sectoral interventions, the approach partially met the needs of the beneficiaries. Also the approach has kick started a good effort towards building trust. The
	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 no analysis of the logical chain. The report does discuss some causal factors, but does not go into the amount of depth required to understand their implications.
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	The report does not sufficiently address this issue. The only discussion around the approach's monitoring is as follows: 'A critical element to support service delivery is a structure for results-based management. Though the evaluation did not study this in-depth, it understands that the monitoring system within UNICEF is robust. This creates an opportunity and a good starting point towards creating institutional sustainability of LLSS interventions by enabling decision making, based on evidence.' No supporting information or analysis was included.
SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)		13%	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).	No	The conclusions are not clearly formatted. The section features instances of summarising the methodological approach or limitations to the evaluation and not conclusions based on the findings. The information presented in the conclusions section is sufficiently forward looking but as noted below, the information in the conclusions section does not clearly link back to the findings.
	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.	No	This link from the finding to the conclusion is unclear as currently written. More effort must be taken to more clearly link the findings to the conclusions. There is a disconnect between what is presented in the findings and what is presented in the conclusions.
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	<p>The lessons learned section requires a rewrite. As currently written, the section includes discussions that are not rooted in the findings but rather general discussion on what needs would be achieved in an 'ideal context'. Further, there are discussions around local authorities' capacities but it is unclear whether this is a general commentary again or if this is based on specific findings from the evaluation.</p> <p>The section then explains what a good practice is and includes good practices from 2006-206 from various countries. The section does include some information from the evaluation, but it is unclear which findings these lessons and good practices are based on. Numbering the findings as suggested above would allow for the revised report to reference specific findings for each lesson learned/good practice. To help readers more easily digest the lessons and good practices, each lesson/good practice should contain a summary header that clearly conveys the lesson/good practice and then provides supporting evidence.</p>
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	The section is not clearly and concisely presented (see comment above regarding the suggestion to include headlines for each lesson learned/good practice then providing supporting evidence and clearly linking back to numbered findings). The section should be revised to highlight lessons learned and good practices stemming from the evaluation findings. The section should also be revised to ensure that there is no strong language such as doing X would have prevented Y or doing x would have curtailed Y, etc. As written, there is some strong assumption regarding the impact some changes could have been.
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>Recommendations are not a specific, listed objective of the evaluation as they are normally in evaluation ToRs.</p> <p>The recommendations are not clearly formulated and do not clearly derive from the findings or conclusions. To increase clarity, the authors should number the recommendations and indicate which findings or conclusions they are based on. At present, it is difficult to see the linkages between findings and conclusions and the recommendations.</p>
	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>Many recommendations do not appear to be actionable given what the authors have shared regarding the national context. It is unclear why some recommendations were given if they are likely nonstarters given the country context. Including details regarding resource requirements, priority level and whether each recommendation should be implemented in the near, medium or long term may help readers understand the feasibility.</p> <p>Other recommendations are relatively simple and not resource intensive. For example, recommendation 1 for local authorities and municipalities: 'Encourage community members to actively participate in local decision-making processes and engage with the local bodies. This can be done through community meetings, public forums, and social media platforms.' This recommendation is likely actionable by local authorities and municipalities in Lebanon. Recommendation 2 and 4 also appear to be low-resource activities that would likely be actionable. Similarly, recommendations 4-9 for UNICEF appear to require low resource levels and appear to be actionable given the country context.</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	The report shares that a validation of preliminary findings with UNICEF was held, but there is no information regarding whether recommendations had been reviewed by duty bearers or rights holders. The process for developing the recommendations - including any stakeholder engagement and feedback - should be included in the final report. If there was no involvement of duty bearers or rights holders, an explanation should be given.
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	The recommendations are split between those meant for local authorities and those directed toward UNICEF. However, the structure of recommendations listed within the bulleted lists following the paragraph 'The evaluation would further recommend UNICEF Lebanon Country Office to take up the following activities...' is unclear. While the recommendations appear to be for UNICEF given the introductory paragraph, the bulleted lists include recommendations for implementing partners, NGOs and a newly formed/recommended municipality committee. There is also no prioritisation or classification to support use. The recommendations would benefit from reorganisation to more clearly indicate their priority level and whether they are linked to the successful completion of other recommendations. The recommendations require revisiting and revision for clarity including responsibility, prioritisation and information regarding whether one recommendation must follow on from another or be accomplished prior to another.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	64%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Partially	The report includes nearly all of the required information listed for this criterion. However, it is missing the timeframe of the evaluation. This could be remedied by adding the evaluation timeframe within the acknowledgements.
	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Yes	The annexes include the terms of reference, evaluation matrix and questions, data collection instruments, list of interviewees, and list of documentary evidence. The programme intervention logic of UNICEF in Lebanon is included within the body of the report (Figure 3). In addition to the annexes listed above, the report includes the sampling frame, examples of successful municipal projects and additional gender analysis.
Question 20.	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	Overall, the report is clearly titled/numbered and easy to navigate. The report would benefit from enabling hyperlinks from the table of contents for easier navigation, but this feature is not a requirement.
	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	Overall, the report follows a logical sequence. However, findings related to gender and human rights are not included under section 3. Evaluation findings. Instead, they are included in section 4. Gender and Human Rights. While the sequencing of the information flows logically, it would be more appropriate for all findings - including those related specifically to gender and human rights - to be presented within the findings section.
Question 21.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	No	The report exceeds the number of pages specified in the ToR (40 pages).
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	There are many instances throughout the report that hinder comprehension of information due to poor sentence structure. Some examples of unclear sentence structure and incomplete sentences include: 'Lack of resources and funding for local bodies and municipalities to implement development projects and provide basic public services.' 'Programmatic interventions that sought to improve the well-being of children facing multiple deprivations by providing holistic services and sensitization packages to vulnerable (both refugees and Lebanese families) were designed and implemented (figure 2 below).' 'These NGOs enabled UNICEF deliver services in difficult areas.' 'Working with municipal authorities and local institutions provide the scope of integrated service delivery.' 'Similarly, the Field Operations RWP for 2022, as an outcome, targeted to achieve Sub-national socio-ecological systems becoming capable of prioritizing, planning, and delivering results for children and by 2024, UNICEF, Government and key humanitarian partners effectively analyze, prepare and coordinate emergency response to children and families at risk and in humanitarian situations, especially those most vulnerable.' Further, there are a number of grammatical and spelling errors throughout. Some examples include: - Compliment instead of complement - Possessive instead of plural: 'NGO's should visit the local authorities' - Odd punctuation, e.g., 'Additionally;-' - 'However, secondary information sources reveal that coherence is not being attempted with other partner's as well in the implementation of the approach.' Finally, acronyms listed in the table appear to be incorrect. E.g., GAT Gender

	iii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Partially	The report contains five figures. Figure 4 cannot be read and the image appears stretched. The figures are labeled, convey key information and are referenced in the text.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)		55%	Comments on Rating
Question 22.	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?			
	i	Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	The evaluation states that a rights-based framework for the evaluation was utilised. Further, the findings section includes analysis around CCC. The report was clear that the evaluation did not include assessments related to the CRC, CEDAW or SDGs.
	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 report clearly indicates the types of stakeholders included in data collection activities. However, it is unclear whether a reference group was formed as part of the evaluation. The report does state that there was a validation workshop, but this was with UNICEF only and it appears no other stakeholders were engaged in the process of commenting on preliminary findings. The report would benefit from additional details regarding the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation (e.g., validation of findings).
	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 used throughout the report is empowering and inclusive and avoids gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias. The report uses terminology of rights holders and duty bearers. The report does not provide data disaggregated by marginalised groups, but notes that the evaluators made efforts to get disaggregated data from documents to quantitatively answer some questions related to effectiveness and sustainability. The report also notes 'The evaluation accessed gender-disaggregated data from monitoring data made available. However, clear desegregation of status i.e. IDPs and refugees offered challenges especially in the absence of government data. Participants in the evaluation had varying levels of understanding of the importance and efficacy of using desegregated data, and some were unable to use it or analyse it.' Regarding the evaluation collecting disaggregated data as part of what was collected during the evaluation, the reviewer notes that the interview/discussion guides do not contain fields for gender of respondents. The list of participants (Annex 4) is not disaggregated by gender.
	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 includes discussion of whether the approach reached those furthest behind. Further, the report claims that the evaluation was disability-inclusive, but includes no details on how the evaluation incorporated inclusivity into the design, data collection or analysis. Still, the fact that the report highlights issues of disability inclusion is a step in the right direction and it is encouraging to see this topic addressed.
Question 23.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)		4	
	i	GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluation assesses whether sufficient information was collected around human rights and gender equality during the implementation. It mainstreams human rights and gender equality considerations across objectives. A standalone criterion on gender / human rights was included in the evaluation framework. There were multiple evaluation questions and sub questions related to gender.
	ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	The evaluation does not specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology. The report does not describe how data collection and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. The evaluation did not collect sex-disaggregated data. The evaluation methodology employed a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations. The evaluation included a diverse range of data sources, but it is less clear how triangulation and validation were employed (as noted in the detailed feedback above). The evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable. Ethical standards were considered throughout the evaluation and all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality.

iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	The evaluation report has a background section that spells out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality. Inasmuch as the existing data allows, the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices (situations) of different social role groups. Unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality are not described. The evaluation provides one recommendation addressing GEWE issues (#3 in second bulleted list).
-----	---	----------------------	--

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>